

THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FORTY-ONE

THIRD QUARTER, 1947

The Origin of Longfellow's *Evangeline*

By MANNING HAWTHORNE and
HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW DANA

ONE hundred years ago, on November 1, 1847, when Longfellow's *Evangeline* was first published, many questions were raised by the critics. From the relatively unimportant problem of the use of hexameters in English poetry, the discussion spread to take up the historic truth of Longfellow's story and the whole problem of the right and wrong of the Acadians and the English. In the course of the century that has passed since this poem appeared, a number of conflicting theories have been advanced as to the possible sources of the story. Perhaps the time has now come to survey the whole field afresh and to settle, if we can, some of the problems connected with the genesis and development of Longfellow's *Evangeline*.

THE EXPULSION OF THE ACADIANS

First of all, let us glance at the contemporary accounts given in journals and letters by the English who were actually engaged in this expulsion of the Acadians during the summer and autumn of 1755. For example, in a letter written on August 9, 1755, from Halifax, Nova Scotia, the English seem at first to have looked forward to this undertaking with some enthusiasm:

We are now upon a great and noble scheme of sending the neutral French [out] of the Province . . . If we can effect their expulsion, it will be one of the greatest things that ever did the English in America; for, by all accounts, that part of the country they possess is as good land as any in the world.¹

Before long, however, Colonel John Winslow, who was in charge of this expedition, wrote to His Majesty's Governor, William Shirley, with a rather bad conscience—and a worse orthography:

Augst 19th arived at Grand Pré and have Viewed the Scituation. and Pleased with the Place Proposed by your Excellency for our reception (vizt the Church).

From my Camp at Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, August 22nd, 1755.

Have taken up my Quarters between the Church & Church yard, haveing the Prest House for my own accomodation and the Church for a Place of Arms . . . Shall Soon have our Hands full of Disagreable Buisness to remove People from their Antient Habitations, which, in this part of the Countrey, are Verry Valuable.²

Winslow went on in his journal to describe how he summoned four hundred and eighteen of the best men in the village, including all lads of ten years or more, to attend a meeting in the Church at Grand Pré on September 5, at three o'clock in the afternoon. There, by means of French interpreters, he delivered to them what he was pleased to call "the King's orders." This proclamation announced to the Acadians that their lands and tenements, cattle of all kinds and livestock of all sorts, were forfeited to the English Crown, and that they themselves were to be removed from this Province. Colonel Winslow then had them all arrested, declaring them to be "the King's Prisoners."³

¹ This letter was printed in *The New York Gazette*, August 25, 1755, and in *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 4, 1755. It has been reprinted in the *Report concerning Canadian Archives* (Ottawa, 1906), II, Appendix A, Part III, "Acadian Genealogy and Notes" by Placide Gaudet, p. xvi.

² The original manuscript of Winslow's Journal has been in the archives of the Massachusetts Historical Society since 1798. It was quoted in part by various historians, but was first printed in full in the *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society* (Halifax, 1883), III, 71-196, and (1885), IV, 113-246. The quotations given here are from pp. 151, 152, 174, 178, 190, 192, 247 and 263 of the original manuscript.

³ Lawrence Henry Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, Vol. VI (New York, 1946), seems to feel that there is no evidence that these Orders came from the King or his Ministers.

Longfellow in *Evangeline* paraphrases this Proclamation rather closely, and it has been suggested that he may have consulted Winslow's original manuscript journal which was preserved in the Massachusetts Historical Society.⁴

In his journal for September 10, 1755, Winslow described how he ordered two hundred and fifty men of the French inhabitants to be embarked on five vessels and watched how they "went of Praying, Singing & Crying being Met by the women & Children all the way (which is 1½ mile) with Great Lamentations upon their Knees praying &c."⁵

The Surgeon in Winslow's Expedition, Doctor John Thomas, has given us in his diary an extraordinarily frank account of the herding off of cattle and human beings alike, and of the burning of the village.⁶

Winslow himself gives in his journal a list of "Buildings Burnt by Colonel Winslow," which include 1 "Mass House" (as he was pleased to call the Catholic church), 11 Mills, 255 Houses, and 276 Barns. Finally he gives the following account of the removal of the rest of the inhabitants of Grand Pré:

October 8th. began to Embarke the Inhabitants who went of Very Solentarily and unwillingly, the women in Great Distress Carrying off Their Children in their arms. Others Carrying their Decript Parents in their Carts and all their Goods Moving in Great Confusion & appeard a Scéen of woe & Distres.⁷

The transport vessels were admittedly overcrowded and little effort was made to keep families or friends together. Those

⁴ Longfellow was not elected a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society until December 18, 1857; but of course could have consulted the manuscript of Winslow's Journal there earlier. It seems most likely however that he was familiar with these passages as they were quoted in Thomas C. Haliburton, *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1829), I, 176-177, and 327-338. The records of the Harvard College Library show that Longfellow took out Haliburton's book on March 3, 1841, January 19, 1846, and April 9, 1847. For the text of the Proclamation, compare the manuscript of Winslow's Journal, p. 190, Haliburton I, 176-177, and *Evangeline* Part I, Canto IV, lines 51-61.

⁵ With this compare *Evangeline* Part I, Canto V, lines 21-29.

⁶ "Diary of John Thomas, Surgeon in Winslow's Expedition of 1755 against the Acadians," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, October, 1879. A reprint of this was presented to Mr. Longfellow and exists today in the Longfellow House at Cambridge.

⁷ With this compare *Evangeline* Part I, Canto V, lines 44-47.

Acadians who reached Philadelphia, in an address to the English King, said:

Parents were separated from children, and husbands from wives, some of whom have not to this day met again; and we were so crowded in the transport vessels, that we had not room even for all our bodies to lay down at once, and consequently were prevented from carrying with us proper necessities, especially for the support and comfort of the aged and weak, many of whom quickly ended their misery with their lives . . . René Leblanc, the notary public . . . was seized, confined, and brought away among the rest of the people, and his family, consisting of twenty children, and about one hundred and fifty grand children, were scattered in different Colonies.⁸

Longfellow undoubtedly had this passage in mind when he introduced into *Evangeline* this Notary Public, René Leblanc, and later on spoke of the dispersal of his large family.⁹

Yet, though this appeal and the contemporary journals and letters give ample evidence of the separation of married couples and of lovers, there seems to be no story there that exactly corresponds to the separation of Gabriel and Evangeline and their life-long search for each other which formed the main theme of Longfellow's poem.

THE HISTORIANS

It is natural that the events recorded in these contemporary documents should have had their repercussions in Europe. In 1755, the very year of the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia, Mairobert published in French at Basle his *Discussion Sommaire*;¹⁰ and to this a reply was published in London during the following year.¹¹

⁸ Thomas C. Haliburton, *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1829), I, 194.

⁹ *Evangeline*, Part I, Canto III; and Part II, Canto V, lines 9-10:

There old René Leblanc had died; and when he departed,
Saw at his side only one of all his hundred descendants.

¹⁰ Mathieu François Pidausat de Mairobert, *Discussion Sommaire sur les Anciennes Limites de l'Acadie* (Basle, 1755). The Harvard College Library copy was bought on May 1, 1845 and bound in July 1846. There is no evidence, however, that Longfellow consulted this volume.

¹¹ *A Fair Representation of His Majesty's Right to Nova-Scotia or Acadie. Briefly Stated from the Memorials of the English Commissaries*. The English Commissaries were William Shirley and William Mildmay. The Harvard College Library copy was acquired October 4, 1830.

It was not, however, until 1770 that the problem of the Acadians received the extended and dignified treatment that it deserved. It was then that the Abbé Raynal, together with Diderot and Holbach and other French Encyclopaedists, introduced an account of the Acadians in their ten-volume *Philosophical and Political History*—a compilation which Voltaire characterized rather caustically as "du réchauffé avec de la déclamation." Into that monumental work was incorporated and warmed up with eloquence a famous passage depicting the beautiful and tranquil "Golden Age" of the innocent Acadians before they were expelled by the English.¹² For Raynal, Acadia was a sort of Arcadia.

Longfellow's description in the opening cantos of *Evangeline*, showing the idyllic life of the Acadians in their village at Grand Pré, clearly reflects this eloquent account of the virtues of the Acadians. Longfellow's own sympathy with the French peasants he had seen during his youthful wandering in the Valley of the Loire and described in his *Outre-Mer* made him naturally receptive to the Abbé Raynal's happy eulogy of the somewhat similar French peasants of Acadia. This was one of the two chief sources of his information on the Acadians. Indeed Longfellow says quite frankly:

The authorities I mostly relied on in writing *Evangeline* were the Abbé Raynal and Mr. Haliburton: the first for the pastoral, simple life of the Acadians; the second for the history of their banishment.¹³

Judge Thomas Chandler Haliburton, a native of Nova Scotia, in his two-volume *History of Nova Scotia* published in Halifax in 1829, made good use of Raynal's glowing picture of the Acadian people, though he said that many thought "that it is worthy rather of the poet than of the historian."¹⁴ Haliburton somewhat

¹² Abbé Thomas Guillaume François Raynal, *Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Etablissements et du Commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes*. (Amsterdam, 1770.)

¹³ Quoted by Horace Elisha Scudder in his Introduction to *Evangeline* (Boston, 1896), p. 6.

¹⁴ Thomas C. Haliburton, *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1829), I, 170-173.

softened Raynal's attack on the tyranny of the British, but he gives a very sympathetic account of the sufferings and wanderings of the Acadians in their dispersal through the various American colonies. It is from Haliburton again that Longfellow was later to draw the general background for his account of the Acadian exiles.

In the year 1829, when Haliburton's book first appeared, Longfellow was studying in Germany and undoubtedly had not yet seen the book. Quite independently, however, he was planning at that time to write a sketch to be called "Down East: The Missionary of Acadie," which was to be included in a series of "New England Sketches." During his boyhood days in Portland and his college days at Brunswick, he may well have heard stories about Acadians. There is nothing, however, to indicate that he had in mind as yet any story of the Acadian lovers separated at the time of the expulsion and spending the rest of their lives in search of each other. Nor is any such story to be found either in Raynal or Haliburton.

Where, then, did Longfellow get that story? That is the problem to which we must now turn.

HAWTHORNE AND "THE MAN OF GOD"

It appears that just such a story was known to a French Canadian woman who married Judge Haliburton's nephew, George Mordaunt Haliburton, shortly after Haliburton's book had been published. In course of time she came to Boston and told this episode at length to her rector there. This rector was the Reverend Horace Lorenzo Conolly, who had come from Salem in 1835 for a brief ministry at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in South Boston. Conolly says that this sad story "made an extraordinary impression upon his mind, and that the lady repeated it to him two or three times."¹⁵

When Conolly returned to Salem, he says that "he told the

¹⁵ Quoted from a letter written by Conolly's friend, George H. Holden, to Samuel Longfellow on May 24, 1885.

story to Hawthorne one day while they were walking over what is now Lafayette Street in Salem, and Hawthorne said he would write a novel about it."¹⁶ Fortunately Hawthorne, in the notebook in which he was in the habit of jotting down suggestions for short stories or novels, has left a brief summary of the woman's story as Conolly first reported it to him. Under date of October 24, 1838, he writes that Conolly "heard from a French Canadian the story of a young couple in Acadia":

On their marriage day, all the men of the Province were summoned to assemble in the church to hear a proclamation. When assembled, they were all seized and shipped off to be distributed through New England,—among them the new bridegroom. His bride set off in search of him,—wandered about New England all her lifetime, and at last, when she was old, she found her bridegroom on his death-bed. The shock was so great that it killed her likewise.¹⁷

The Reverend Mr. Conolly has left a rather long-winded manuscript account of this whole matter, in which he claims that Hawthorne "brooded over the story" but "could not make anything out of it"; that he "had it on trial" for several years; that Conolly "repeated the same story two or three times"; but that Hawthorne always asserted: "It is not in my vein: there are no strong lights and heavy shadows. It is a good story, but it is not in my vein. I might use it perhaps interwoven with something else."¹⁸

A few years later, Hawthorne came to dinner one day with Longfellow in Cambridge and brought with him the Reverend Mr. Conolly or "The Man of God," as Hawthorne was pleased to call him.¹⁹ After the other guests, Felton and Hillard, had left,

¹⁶ From an interview with Conolly entitled "He Knew Hawthorne," published in the *Salem News*, August, 1893, p. 3.

¹⁷ This was first published in *Passages from the American Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Boston, 1868), I, 203, four years after Hawthorne's death, and edited by his widow. Unfortunately the manuscript of this part of Hawthorne's Note-Books cannot now be found and therefore this passage is not included in the edition by Randall Stewart published by the Yale University Press in 1932.

¹⁸ Conolly's manuscript was found in the Bowdoin College Library by Manning Hawthorne, and published in full by him in *The Colophon*, New Series, II, 262-282 (1937): "Hawthorne and 'The Man of God.'"

¹⁹ The exact date of this meeting has not yet been determined, but Longfellow

Longfellow, according to Conolly's account, turned to Hawthorne and said: "Why don't you write something—write a long story—write a novel?" Hawthorne's reply was: "I have nothing to write about." Thereupon Conolly asked him why he did not write about the Acadian story he had related to him. Hawthorne repeated: "It is not in my vein." Longfellow is then reported to have turned to Conolly and asked: "What is the story? Do tell it. Perhaps it will be in *my* vein."

Longfellow wrote a manuscript memorandum of this conversation which is now in the Library of the Nova Scotia Historical Society. In this he quotes Conolly as saying:

I have been trying to persuade Hawthorne to write a Story, based upon a legend of Acadie, and still current there; the legend of a girl, who in the dispersion of the Acadians, was separated from her lover, and passed her life in waiting and seeking for him, and only finding him dying in a hospital, when both were old.

Conolly claims that his telling of the story to Longfellow took "about an hour, including the interruptions and inquiries of Hawthorne and Longfellow"; and that Hawthorne declared that he had never told it to him "with half the effect." Conolly says: "Longfellow followed my narrative with great attention and apparently very deep interest." At the conclusion he quotes Longfellow as saying: "It is the best illustration of faithfulness and the constancy of woman that I have ever heard of or read."

Longfellow in his manuscript memorandum says that he "wondered that this legend did not strike the fancy of Hawthorne"; and that he said to him: "If you have really made up your mind not to use it for a story, will you give it to me for a poem?" Longfellow adds: "To this Hawthorne assented, and moreover promised not to treat the subject in prose until L[ongfellow] had seen what he could do with it in verse."

records in his journal for April 5, 1840, a dinner at which Hawthorne, Hillard, and Felton were present, and it may have been on this occasion that Hawthorne brought his friend Conolly. Conolly's friend George H. Holden (in his letter to Samuel Longfellow of May 24, 1885) implies that the story was related to Longfellow by Conolly "in 1840 or 1841."

According to Conolly, Hawthorne then said to Longfellow: "Even if you should write a poem and I a novel, so different would be the views we would take that no one would ever recognize that they were both on the same subject."

Conolly claims that at first Hawthorne "was not pleased with the idea of giving up the thing to Longfellow." He goes on to relate in some detail how, after leaving Longfellow's house and on their way back from Cambridge to Boston, the storm of Hawthorne's wrath broke upon him furiously in a transcendental tirade of profanity and swearing. No doubt the minister was unduly sensitive to any use of profanity and may have tended to exaggerate Hawthorne's reaction on this occasion. If, however, Hawthorne really wanted to keep the story for himself, it makes it all the more generous on his part to have relinquished the story in such a way in Longfellow's presence that Longfellow had little idea of the sacrifice which his friend was making.

In 1841 Hawthorne sent to Longfellow a little book called *Famous Old People*, with the simple inscription on the fly-leaf: "Longfellow from the Author." In this book Hawthorne included an account of "The Removal of the Inhabitants of Acadia." He kept his promise, however, and refrained from bringing in the particular episode which he had handed over to Longfellow. His touching account of the exile in general, however, may well have served to whet Longfellow's almost blunted purpose of writing his own "Tale of Acadie." The following brief extracts from the thirteen pages which Hawthorne devoted to the subject may give an idea of the powerful passage which he entitled:

THE ACADIAN EXILES

A sad day it was for the poor Acadians when the armed soldiers drove them, at the point of the bayonet, down to the sea-shore. Very sad were they, likewise, when tossing about the ocean in the crowded transport vessels. . . . They huddled together and looked into one another's faces for the comfort which was not there. . . . They had been confined on board of separate vessels, so they could not tell, whether their relatives and friends were prisoners along with them. . . . Now a

desolate wife might be heard calling for her husband. He, alas! had gone, she knew not whither. . . . Young men and maidens, whose hearts had been torn asunder by separation, had hoped, during the voyage, to meet their beloved ones at its close. Now they began to feel that they were separated forever. . . . To think of a whole people homeless in the world! . . . There never was any thing so sad! . . . England's triumph and increased dominion could not compensate to mankind nor atone to Heaven for the ashes of a single Acadian cottage.²⁰

At the end of this passage, apparently with Longfellow in mind, Hawthorne added:

Methinks, if I were an American poet, I would choose Acadia for the subject of my song.

In later editions, after *Evangeline* had been published, Hawthorne was to add a further paragraph, saying:

Since Grandfather first spoke these words, the most famous of American poets has drawn sweet tears from all of us by his beautiful poem of *Evangeline*.

On March 3, 1841, spurred on to find out more for himself about the Acadians, Longfellow got out from the Harvard College Library both volumes of Haliburton's *History of Nova Scotia*. This gave Longfellow, as he was glad to admit, the general background of the history of the banishment of the Acadians, against which he could set his particular story of the separation of Gabriel and *Evangeline*.

After this reading, Longfellow was apparently eager to consult Hawthorne and Conolly once more about their sources of information, and invited Hawthorne to bring Conolly to see him a second time. On March 8, 1841, Hawthorne wrote Longfellow: "We will come at the hour appointed—at least, I will, and no doubt the parson, who I expect from Salem today."²¹ It was no doubt to this dinner with Hawthorne and Conolly, that the Reverend Mr. Conolly refers when he says:

²⁰ Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Famous Old People: Being The Second Epoch of Grandfather's Chair* (Boston, 1841), pp. 124-135.

²¹ Quoted with permission from the original manuscript in the Harvard College Library.

Perhaps a year or two after the narrative was first given—it befell that after they had departed and were sauntering in the direction of the college grounds, Longfellow overtook them and asked Conolly to tell him the story afresh. [Longfellow] listened intently and now and then interrupted the narrator with questions.²²

Later in 1841, Longfellow may well have been further stimulated by finding in the same volume of *The Token*, which contained some verses of his own, a prose article entitled "The Exiles of Acadia." This was written by the historian George Bancroft who said:

I know not if the annals of the human race keep the records of sorrows so wantonly inflicted, so bitter and so perennial, as fell upon the French inhabitants of Acadia.

The article in *The Token* ended with a picture of Acadia laid desolate after the English had driven the Acadians out:

Thickets of forest trees choked their orchards: the ocean broke over their neglected dikes, and desolated their meadows.²³

This passage from Bancroft seems to have had an echo in the closing lines of Longfellow's *Evangeline*.

Another publication of 1841, a novel by Mrs. Catherine Arnold Williams, of Providence, Rhode Island, was called *The Neutral French, or the Exiles of Nova Scotia*. It has been claimed that it was this novel which first suggested to Longfellow the story of *Evangeline*; but by this time, Longfellow had already his own story well in mind. Moreover the story of Pauline, the heroine of *The Neutral French*, who takes an active part in the Revolution in 1775 at Boston and later marries a French Chevalier and tries to get Louis XVI to escape the French Revolution by coming to America, is surely a very different story from that of *Evangeline*. Such superficial resemblances between Mrs. Williams' novel and Longfellow's poem as have been pointed out, are no doubt due to

²² Letter from Conolly's friend, George H. Holden, to Samuel Longfellow, May 24, 1885.

²³ *The Token and Atlantic Souvenir, an Offering for Christmas and the New Year*, Boston, Copyright 1841, pp. 279-289.

the fact that both made use of the same sources: Raynal and Haliburton. Indeed there is no reason to suppose that Longfellow knew of this two-volume novel until after he had written his poem. Some twelve years after the publication of *Evangeline*, Longfellow received from the humorist, Frederick Swartwout Cozzens, a copy of his book *Acadia; or, A Month with the Blue Noses*, in which he describes his journey which he was pleased to call an "Evangeliad." In the preface to his book he claimed that Longfellow's poem was "inspired" by Mrs. Williams' novel and even went so far as to say: "The Evangeline of Longfellow and the Pauline of this lady's legend are pictures of the same individual." Longfellow thanked him for his "witty and wise" book, but added:

In one matter let me set you right. You are wrong in supposing 'Evangeline' to have been suggested by the "Neutral French," of Mrs. Williams. The story was told me—that is the bare outline of it—by a friend of Hawthorne, who had been urging him to write a tale on the subject. I said to Hawthorne: "I wish you would give it to me for a poem." He did so immediately not seeming to care about it, nor desiring to write on the theme.²⁴

PART THE FIRST

For a time the idea of writing a tale of Acadie lay fallow in Longfellow's mind. In the meanwhile he was preoccupied with other concerns: in 1842 with completing his *Spanish Student* and making another journey abroad; in 1843 with becoming engaged and married to Miss Frances Elizabeth Appleton; in 1844 and 1845 with the colossal task of getting out his eight-hundred-page *Poets and Poetry of Europe*.

It was only towards the end of 1845 that Longfellow was at last free to turn to his long-neglected project. On November 28 of that year he began the manuscript of what was later to be called

²⁴ Quoted with permission from the original manuscript owned by the late Carroll A. Wilson of Longfellow's letter to Cozzens, July 7, 1859. Professor Ernest Martin in his thesis *L'Évangéline de Longfellow et la Suite Merveilleuse d'un Poème* (Paris, 1936), pp. 101-115 and 329-346, under the headings "Une Découverte" and "Une Nouvelle Source d'Evangéline," apparently not knowing about the book by Cozzens published in 1859, seems to imagine that this "source" was first claimed by him in 1936.

Evangeline, A Tale of Acadie. In his manuscript the opening line of what he first called "Introduction" or "Prologue," originally ran:

Still stands the forest primeval. The gnarled oaks and the hemlocks.

Later Longfellow changed this to read:

This is the forest primeval. The murmuring pines and the hemlocks.

Possibly this was in remembrance of the "whispering pines" of Bowdoin—the "pinos loquentes"—whose voices he so often associated with Hawthorne's own.

Longfellow had never been to Nova Scotia, and it has been said that this opening line, especially as emended, is the most untruthful of the whole poem. For the great salt marshes washed by the sixty-foot tides of the Bay of Fundy, dotted with a few willow trees (the earlier growth having been destroyed by forest fires) had in 1755 little to suggest either "the forest primeval" or "the murmuring pines." The fact is that Longfellow was mingling together a number of different impressions. In *The Boston Book* for 1841, he had published an article called "Life in Sweden" describing the idyllic existence he had found among the Swedish peasants, and it has been pointed out that some of this same description has colored the picture that he gives of the Acadian peasants in the opening cantos of *Evangeline*. A similar atmosphere is to be found in Longfellow's translations from the Swedish poet Tegnér's *Frithiof's Saga* and *The Children of the Lord's Supper*.²⁵

Moreover, during the year 1845 Longfellow had been translating Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* to his students at Har-

²⁵ "Life in Sweden," *The Boston Book* (Boston, 1841), pp. 193-201. This was a revised version of the description of rural Swedish life given in Longfellow's review of "Tegner's Frithiof's Saga," *North American Review*, XLV, 149-185 (July, 1837). Both have a clear connection with Longfellow's journal in Sweden, June 21-September 10, 1835. This description was used again in Longfellow's Preface to *Ballads and Other Poems* (Cambridge, 1842), pp. vii-xxiv. The connection with the opening cantos of *Evangeline* was pointed out in Paul Robert Leider's Introduction to the translation by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and W. Lewery Blackley of Poems by Tegnér: *The Children of the Lord's Supper, Frithiof's Saga* (New York, 1914), pp. i-xxvii. See also Anton Hermann Appelmann, "The Relation of Longfellow's *Evangeline* to Tegnér's *Frithiof's Saga*," *Publications of the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Study*, II, No. 3 (July, 1915).

vard.²⁶ To be sure, the stories in the two poems are somewhat different; for Goethe's Hermann is the son of a German inn-keeper and first meets Dorothea when he sees her among a band of exiles driven from their burned village. Yet much of the atmosphere of simplicity and the tragedy of exile are similar, and perhaps Oliver Wendell Holmes has some justification for his remark: "Dorothea was the mother of Evangeline."²⁷

In any case, the use of hexameters both by Tegnér and Goethe in their poems may have encouraged Longfellow to use in his *Evangeline* the same meter—"the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man."

The manuscript of the first canto of Longfellow's *Evangeline* and the entries in Longfellow's journal both indicate some uncertainty on his part as to the names that he intended to give to various characters. Apparently at first he was planning to call both his heroine and the poem as a whole by the name of "Gabrielle." In his journal for November 28, 1845, he wrote: "Set about 'Gabrielle,' my Idyl in hexameters, in earnest." On December 4, he wrote:

The first snow-storm of the season, whirling about a little in the North-west wind. I mean to have a quiet day in-doors and work bravely at 'Gabrielle.'

By December 7, however, he was uncertain what name to give his new poem and wrote: "Shall it be 'Gabrielle?' or 'Celestine?' or 'Evangeline?'" All these names had religious associations appropriate for a pious Acadian Catholic maiden. "Gabrielle" suggested the Archangel Gabriel; "Celestine" the celestial; and "Evangeline" the Evangel, or Holy Gospel. "Gabrielle," however, risked being pronounced by Americans or English too much like the more familiar masculine form "Gabriel," a name which Longfellow later transferred to his hero. "Celestine" was somewhat spoiled for Longfellow by the unfortunate connotation of

²⁶ Ernest Martin, *L'Évangéline de Longfellow et la Suite Merveilleuse d'un Poème* (Paris, 1936), p. 116.

²⁷ *Tributes to Longfellow and Emerson by the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1882), p. 21.

the notorious "Celestina" of the early Spanish story.²⁸ From January 8, 1846, on, then, the name "Evangeline" prevailed, a name not previously widely spread, but now made famous by Longfellow's poem.

As the original manuscript shows, there was at first some uncertainty about the names of the other characters in the poem. "Basil" was the name at first applied to Evangeline's father; he was next called "Olivier"; and only finally changed to "Benedict Bellefontaine." Meanwhile the name "Basil" was transferred to Gabriel's father, "Basil the blacksmith." To Gabriel and his father, the last name of "Lajeunesse" was only added a year later. The priest was at first given the names of early Church Fathers, "Father Jerome" or "Father Anselmus," but was finally changed to the rather more French name of "Father Felician."

The original manuscript, moreover, included several passages which were later omitted and have never appeared in printed form. For example, in this First Canto, there were originally three additional episodes showing the close friendship of Gabriel and Evangeline in their youth which added further poignancy to their separation later on. One described their voices blending together in the singing of the evening hymn and went as follows:

Sweet it was in the hush of an evening in Summer, to hear them
Singing together that hymn of the holy Catholic mission:
"Counted our steps are, our moments are numbered, and all things
are passing!

Swift as a torrent, our days glide onward and all things are passing!"²⁹

Another passage pictured them as watching their reflections in a spring:

Often they sat by the spring and saw how it sent up its waters
Out of the mimic crater of golden sands on the bottom;

²⁸ On November 28, 1842, Longfellow took out from the Harvard College Library *La Celestina* or the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* which had first been published in 1499, the famous story of an infamous prostitute.

²⁹ These lines from p. 22 of Longfellow's manuscript originally came after line 122 of the final printed text.

Saw their faces reflected below, and with innocent laughter
Kissed each other's cheeks to see their kisses repeated.³⁰

Finally there was a passage describing them wandering in the woods or along the seashore:

Oft through the woods they wandered, to gather the beautiful may-flowers
Under the last year's leaves, or late in the month of September
Filled their baskets with chestnuts, the favorite food of the rein-deer;
Often in summer they strayed by the ocean, and searching for sea-shells,
Ankle-deep in the sheeted tide, and then like the beach-birds
Chased the sibilant wave as slowly it slid down the shingles.³¹

For one reason or another, possibly because he felt that these, together with the passages which he left, made too many sentences beginning with "Oft" or "Often," he decided to omit all three of these passages when *Evangeline* was finally printed.

PART I CANTO II

In the Second Canto nine lines describing the elaborate clock, with its moon and ships and lighthouse and door opening and bird coming forth and singing, were omitted; apparently because Longfellow, recalling the simplicity of the rural life he had depicted, raised the question: "Could an Acadian farmer have had a clock of this kind?" In the original manuscript the dialogue between the more belligerent Basil the blacksmith, Gabriel's father, and the more pacific farmer, Evangeline's father, was rather more pointed. For Longfellow originally had the blacksmith speak of the indignation of the folk in the village against the English and say:

Still Mount Desert they recall and the martyr priest, who was shot there!³²

³⁰ These lines from p. 24A of Longfellow's manuscript originally came after line 128 of the final printed text.

³¹ These lines from pp. 24-25 of Longfellow's manuscript originally came after line 133 of the final printed text. The first three lines of this passage were omitted at the last moment at the insistence of Longfellow's friend, Charles Folsom, who asked: "Why is the *rein-deer* introduced? Surely he visits not Acadia if indeed he ever gets chestnuts to eat."

³² This line from p. 51 of Longfellow's manuscript originally came after line 248 of the final printed text.

In contrast to this he had the farmer say:

Peace is the prayer of the farmer. A brave and generous nation
Will not molest a land, that is only strong in its weakness.³³

For some reason both of these passages were omitted before the text was printed. These first opening sections of *Evangeline* occupied Longfellow until January 12, 1846, when he entered in his journal: "Two Cantos are now done." A week later on January 19, he took out the volumes of Haliburton's history again from the Harvard Library, to refresh his memory of the historical background for his story.

PART I CANTO III

During the month of February, 1846, Longfellow jumped ahead to write a rough draft of some of the episodes dealing with the expulsion of the Acadians and then laid the work aside during March. In his journal for April 5, 1846, he wrote: "After a month's cessation resumed *Evangeline*." He then filled in the story of the coming of the Notary Public, René Leblanc, and the signing of the marriage contract. He put into the mouth of the somewhat long-winded Notary Public, bits of French folklore found by Longfellow in Frédéric Pluquet's *Contes Populaires*, Rouen, 1834, about the Were-Wolf or Loup-Garou and the ghost of an unchristened child, the white Létiche, who haunted the chambers of children and even the somewhat incongruous story of the lost necklace of pearls finally found in a magpie's nest built in one of the scales upheld by a statute of Justice—the story told in Rossini's opera *The Robber Magpie* (*La Gazza Ladra*).

PART I CANTO IV

At the end of the Fourth Canto, that dealing with the arrest of Acadian men in the church at Grand Pré, Longfellow wrote in the margin of his manuscript: "April 14, 1846." Two weeks later, however, on April 29, he wrote in his journal: "Looked over the

³³ These lines from p. 53 of Longfellow's manuscript originally came after line 257 of the final printed text.

'Receuil de Cantiques, à l'usage des Missions, Retraites et Catechismes. Quebec, 1833.' A curious book in which the most ardent spiritual canticles are sung to common airs and dancing tunes." The idea then occurred to him to add a passage near the beginning of this canto in which he had Michael the Fiddler sing some of these songs: *Tous les Bourgeois de Chartres*, and *Le Carillon de Dunquerque*. In his original rough draft in pencil Longfellow also listed two other songs which he later omitted: *Charmante Gabrielle* and the *Bourrée d'Auvergne*. Perhaps it may have been the association of the name "Gabrielle" with this secular song that led Longfellow to change the name of his heroine—and his poem—from "Gabrielle" to "Evangeline."

PART I CANTO V

The Fifth Canto, the last of Part the First of *Evangeline*, dealing with the separation of Gabriel and Evangeline, the embarking of the Acadians on the ships, the burning of the village of Grand Pré, and the death of Evangeline's father, bears in Longfellow's manuscript scattered dates of May 18, 30, June 16, 27, and then after several months, November 14, 1846. At the end of the completed manuscript of Part the First, Longfellow has written in the margin: "November. 25. 1846. Nine at Night."

PART THE SECOND

In the First Part the scene of the poem had been restricted to the little Acadian village of Grand Pré; but in the Second Part Longfellow gradually opened up the wider panorama of the whole American continent. It was only as he went along that his plan of work expanded to these larger proportions. On December 10, 1846, he wrote in his journal:

Commenced the Second Part of *Evangeline*. I felt all day wretched enough to give it the sombre tone of coloring, that belongs to the theme.

Apparently he originally intended to skip over the intervening years after the expulsion from Acadia and come rapidly to the

closing scene in Philadelphia. Accordingly the Second Part originally described Evangeline as having already grown old and gray. The opening line of the Second Part indicated the passing of time since the departure from Grand Pré, described at the end of the First Part, down to the final scene. In the manuscript this opening line originally read:

More than thirty years had lapsed since the burning of Grand Pré.

When, however, Longfellow changed his mind and decided to indicate the gradual passage of time by filling in a number of intervening scenes, he revised this opening line so that, in place of "more than thirty years," a vaguer sense of the passage of time was given:

Many a weary year had passed since the burning of Grand Pré.

Similarly, when he had intended to jump to the final scene, Longfellow had written of Evangeline in his first draft, "faded she was and old." Later, when he decided to put in the intermediate scenes, he substituted the phrase "fair she was and young."

In the margin of Longfellow's manuscript, the dates indicate that he was now writing something on the poem almost every day: December 10, 12, 14, 15, 1846. As he worked, new possibilities for the remaining part of the poem opened up before him, and in his journal for December 15, he wrote:

Planning out the Second Part, which fascinates me, if I can but give complete tone and expression to it. In materials for this part there is superabundance. The difficulty is to select, and give unity to variety.

Two days later, on December 17, 1846, he wrote: "Finished this morning and copied the first canto of the Second Part of *Evangeline*." What he meant by "copied" he explained as follows. In the evenings, to save the strain on his eyes, he sat with a portfolio of large loose sheets in his lap. "I . . . scrawled with a pencil on my knee in the dark . . . I can sit by the fireside, and do not use my eyes." The following morning by daylight, standing at his desk

by the window, he would take the rough sheets he had written on the night before and copy them in ink on pale blue sheets of a smaller size. Fortunately the rough pencil drafts with their corrections and the ink copy with further corrections and additions still exist: so that it is possible to trace the gradual development of the various lines of the poem.

This process of composition may seem to have been a very laborious one. Yet, as Longfellow later said to someone who spoke of how delightfully easy it was to read this poem: "*Evangeline* is so easy for you to read because it was so hard for me to write."

PART II CANTO V

When Longfellow continued writing *Evangeline* on December 20, 1846, he passed at once from the short opening canto of the Second Part to the final scene in Philadelphia, which later became the last canto of the whole poem. He seemed impatient to pass over the intervening cantos dealing with the Mississippi and Louisiana and the West, none of which he had ever visited, and come at once to the scene in Philadelphia, the only place mentioned in the poem which he had actually seen. For as a boy of nineteen, in May, 1826, Longfellow had visited Philadelphia, and now twenty years later, remembered the old Alms House which then "stood on the square between Spruce and Pine and Tenth and Eleventh Streets." He described it as "a large building with beautiful trees about it, inside a high enclosure. I walked along until I came to the great gate, and then stepped inside, and looked carefully over the place. The charming picture of lawn, flower-beds and shade which it presented made an impression which has never left me."³⁴ It was this building he had in mind as

³⁴ *The New-York Times*, May 31, 1881, reprinted an interview that Longfellow had given to a Philadelphia journalist, in which Longfellow described his visit to Philadelphia in May, 1826. On March 12, 1876, Longfellow had given a similar description of this "old Alms House within high brick walls and with trees growing in its enclosure" in a letter to Miss Elizabeth S. Phelps. On March 30, 1876, in a letter to Miss Anna T. Wills, of Philadelphia, printed in *Poet-Lore*, XIV, 109 (October, 1902), he called the building "the Alms-House of the Friends." Many persons, then, have supposed that it was the Quaker Alms House on Walnut Street between Third and Fourth. When, however, Miss Dorothea Dix sent him a photograph of the

the place of the final meeting of Evangeline and Gabriel.

On another of Longfellow's rambles in Philadelphia in 1826, he had found by chance "an old Catholic grave-yard not far away," and there, "in the heart of the city," he later imagined Evangeline and Gabriel lying buried, "unknown and unnoticed":

Side by side, in their nameless graves, the lovers are sleeping
Under the humble walls of the little Catholic churchyard.

Longfellow wished to eke out his own early memories of Philadelphia with further information, and on January 7, 1847, he wrote in his journal: "Went to the Library; and got Watson's *Annals of Philadelphia and the Historical Collections of Pennsylvania*." In Watson's *Annals*, he read the section about "The Landing of Penn at the Blue Anchor Tavern" and found there an old illustration of the tavern and the landing place.³⁵ At first Longfellow conceived the idea of having Evangeline land at this same spot when she came to Philadelphia, and in his rough draft in pencil he wrote:

There from the windy seas had the priest and Evangeline landed
On the same sandy beach, in front of the Blue Anchor Tavern,
Where near a century sooner had landed the Chief of the Quakers.

Later for some reason or other Longfellow decided to omit these lines.

It was also in Watson's *Annals* that he read of the plague of Yellow Fever in Philadelphia in 1793 and evidently decided to depict Gabriel, thirty-eight years after his expulsion from Acadia, finally dying as one of the many pitiful victims of that epidemic. Watson had spoken of this plague as having been presaged by a flight of wild pigeons that "darken all the sky" with "nothing in

Friends Alms House, Longfellow wrote her on April 26, 1876, saying that that was not the place he had in mind; and when he went later in the year to visit the Centennial in Philadelphia, he confirmed his impression that the building he had in mind was not the Quaker Alms House on Walnut Street, but the Pennsylvania Hospital on Spruce Street.

³⁵ John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia, Being a Collection of Memoirs, Anecdotes, & Incidents of the City and its Inhabitants from the Days of the Pilgrim Founders* (Philadelphia, 1830), p. 121.

their craws besides a single acorn." Longfellow wrote:

Then it came to pass that a pestilence fell on the city,
 Presaged by wondrous signs, and mostly by flocks of wild pigeons,
 Darkening the sun in their flight, with naught in their craws but an
 acorn.³⁶

In his manuscript Longfellow first wrote that when Evangeline entered the Alms House,

She was returning from morning mass in the Catholic chapel;
 And in her heart were peace and the benediction of worship.

He had first planned to have her recognize Gabriel because

Loosely about his neck hung a silken cord and a locket.

Later, perhaps wisely, Longfellow decided to omit this device of recognition, which had already been over-used in fiction, and preferred to have Evangeline know Gabriel at once even after all these years and changes. Originally he wrote that as she sat beside Gabriel,

He could feel in his own the warmth of her hand and its pressure.

As Gabriel died with his head on her bosom Longfellow originally had one more line:

Hushed lay the heart of the dead on the beating heart of the living.³⁷

For some reason all these isolated lines were later omitted.

Longfellow had now come to the end of his poem; but in the meanwhile he had definitely decided to go back and write up the three cantos describing the long wanderings of Evangeline before she finally came to Philadelphia. Accordingly he wrote in his journal for January 14, 1847: "Finished the last Canto of *Evangeline*; but the poem is not finished. There are three intermediate Cantos to be written." To these intermediate Cantos he now turned.

³⁶ Watson's *Annals* (Philadelphia, 1830), pp. 317 and 639; and *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto V, lines 47-49.

³⁷ Longfellow's bound manuscript of *Evangeline*, pp. 304, 310, 315, and 317.

PART II CANTO II

In turning back to write up the Second Canto of the Second Part, that dealing with Evangeline's voyage down the Ohio River to the Mississippi and to the Bayous of Louisiana, Longfellow, though he had never visited those regions, used many sources of information to prepare himself for the task. He had read the letters of his sister, Mary Longfellow Greenleaf, describing her journey down the Ohio and Mississippi to New Orleans in 1840 and in subsequent years. Another opportunity for Longfellow to get a vista of the voyage down the Mississippi was an elaborate panorama of the river which was brought to Boston. Longfellow had written in his journal for December 17, 1846: "The river comes to me instead of my going to the river; and as it is to flow through the pages of this poem, I look upon this as a special benediction." Two days later, on December 19, he wrote: "Went to see Bonvard's Moving Diorama of the Mississippi. Very good. One seems to be sailing down the great stream; and sees the boats and sand-banks crested with cotton-wood, and the bayous by moonlight. Three miles of canvas; and a great deal of merit."

This picture, which is said to have been the largest painting ever made, was merely one of many devices which Longfellow used, together with books of travel and their maps and illustrations, to fill out his information of the American landscape. As he wrote to the German poet Freiligrath later (November 23, 1847): "There are sundry descriptions of American scenery to which I have endeavoured to give the true and peculiar coloring of Nature."

On December 29, Longfellow had taken out from the Harvard College Library a book of travels by Timothy Flint of Louisiana, and had read the graphic account given there of the journey from Pittsburgh down the Ohio and Mississippi.³⁸ On

³⁸ Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years, Passed in Occasional Residences and Journeyings in the Valley of the Mississippi* (Boston, 1826). It has also been suggested that Judge Edward Simon, who had been studying at the Harvard Law School in 1846, may have given Longfellow some information about Louisiana

January 7, 1847, he wrote in his Journal: "Went to the Library and got . . . Darby's Geographical Description of Louisiana."³⁹ This he read in order, as he said, to get "facts and local coloring." In his own library he had a still earlier book, *Travels in Louisiana . . . in the Year, 1802*, translated from the French by John Davis.

The book, however, which seems to have helped Longfellow most in his poetic description of Louisiana was Sealsfield's *Life in the New World*. On the fly-leaf at the end of Longfellow's copy of this book are references to subjects that were of interest to him and the page numbers where they can be found. In his journal for January 12, 23, and 24, Longfellow refers to his reading of Sealsfield: "A delicious description of natural scenery We read our favorite Seatsfield, or rather Sealsfield, as he chooses to write the name. His descriptions of the South West are very striking. The Creole Ball we read this evening—quite life-like, and the passage through a cypress-swamp terrible In the evening Sealsfield's description of the Attakapas."⁴⁰

Sealsfield's account of the poor Acadians' finding shelter in Louisiana among those who spoke their native language of French, and settling there at what came to be called the "Côte des Acadiens," finds its echo in Longfellow's opening lines of the

and may have told him the story of the Acadian lovers Louis Arceneaux and Emmeline Labiche. This story, however, which was apparently first told in print in 1907 by Judge Felix Voorhies in his *Acadian Reminiscences With the True Story of Evangeline* (New Iberia, Louisiana, 1907), pp. 82-90, says that Emmeline found her lover Louis had pledged his faith to another and that Emmeline thereupon became "hopelessly insane." This is evidently an entirely different story from that of Evangeline, and no evidence has yet been given to show that Longfellow ever met Judge Simon, or that Judge Simon ever knew the story.

³⁹ William Darby, *A Geographical Description of the State of Louisiana* (With a Map and Index) (Philadelphia, 1816).

⁴⁰ *Life in the New World; or Sketches of American Society*, by Seatsfield. Translated from the German by Gustavus C. Hebbe, L.L.D. and James Mackay, M.A. (New York, 1844). Karl Anton Postl (1793-1864) was a fugitive monk from Austria, who assumed the pseudonyms of "Charles Sidons," "Charles Sealsfield," and "Seatsfield." In addition to the parallels pointed out here, still others have been pointed out by Murray Gardner Hill, "Some of Longfellow's Sources for the Second Part of *Evangeline*," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXXI, 161-180 (1916). I am only too glad to express my indebtedness, in discussing the whole Second Part of *Evangeline*, to Mr. Hill.

Second Canto of the Second Part of *Evangeline* where he refers to the "Acadian coast."⁴¹

Sealsfield's description of the Cypress-Swamp in the labyrinth of bayous, with the trailing mosses festooned from the trees and the haunting sounds of the laughter of the owl and the roar of the alligator, is closely followed in Longfellow's description of the bayou of Plaquemine.⁴²

Sealsfield's description of the song of the mocking bird in the Bayou Têche undoubtedly influenced Longfellow's description of the mocking bird at the end of this canto.⁴³ In his journal for January 26, 1847, Longfellow wrote: "Finished Second Canto of Part II of *Evangeline*. I then tried a passage of it in the common rhymed English Pentameter. It is the song of the mocking-bird." From these two versions of the same passage, let us take merely two lines for comparison. Let us listen first to the description in hexameters of how the mocking bird

Shook from his little throat such floods of delirious music,
That the whole air and the woods and the waves seemed silent
to listen.

With these hexameters, then, we can compare the same two lines as Longfellow experimented with them in Heroic Couplet:

Poured such delirious music from his throat,
That all the air seemed listening to his note.

For other bird sounds, Longfellow turned to the four volumes of Audubon's *Ornithological Biography*, which he had taken out from the Harvard Library on December 29, 1846. On a loose sheet of paper Longfellow has jotted down, with the corresponding numbers of volume and page in Audubon, some references to these bird notes. For example the "delicate soft *whirr*" of the "Prairie Warbler" and the "melancholy" and "soothing" sound

⁴¹ Sealsfield, p. 68 and *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto II, lines 5-10.

⁴² Sealsfield, pp. 224-225 and *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto II, lines 26-65.

⁴³ Sealsfield, p. 230 and *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto II, lines 133-142.

of the "Chuck-Will's-Widow" in "the forests of Louisiana."⁴⁴

On January 22, 1847, he took from the College Library the works of Chateaubriand in order to read the *Voyage en Amérique* and get further riches of color for his descriptions.

By this time Longfellow realized that his work on *Evangeline* was drawing to a close, and remembering how great his debt had been to Nathaniel Hawthorne for letting him use this story, he wrote to him asking if he would care to have any of the poem read aloud to him. To this, Hawthorne replied on January 23, 1847: "I rejoice to hear that the poem is near its completion and will certainly come and listen to as much of it as you will vouchsafe to read."

PART II CANTO III

On February 1, 1847, Longfellow wrote: "Began the last Canto save one of *Evangeline*, that is Canto III of Part Second; Canto V being already written. I shall soon have work accomplished before I am forty years old."⁴⁵ It was in this Third Canto that he used Sealsfield's description of the "Creole Ball" which he had found "quite life-like"; and in *Evangeline* depicted the Creoles as giving themselves to the maddening

Whirl of the giddy dance, as it swept and swayed to the music,
Dreamlike, with beaming eyes and the rush of fluttering garments.⁴⁶

From the various sources of information about the Louisiana lowlands with which Longfellow had been saturating himself, he had accumulated a number of beautiful names of places, many of which made delicious dactyls for his hexameters. One name seemed to hold a peculiar melancholy enchantment. This was "Atchafalaya," the name of the lake where, screened by an in-

⁴⁴ John James Audubon, *Ornithological Biography, or an Account of the Habits of the Birds of the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1832), I, 76, and I, 273. Longfellow again writes in his journal of reading Audubon on February 2, 1847.

⁴⁵ This was written on a loose sheet of paper, now in the Edward Lawrence Doheny Memorial Library, Camarillo, California. In copying this into his journal, Longfellow phrased it somewhat differently: "During the day worked busily and pleasantly on *Evangeline*, Canto III of Part Second. Nearly finished."

⁴⁶ Sealsfield, pp. 228, 229, and *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto III, lines 120-133.

tervening island, the boats of the lovers passed each other and failed to see each other in passing. The name "Atchafalaya," associated as it was with this incident, seems to have become almost a symbol for fateful irony. Ten years after *Evangeline* was published and had been translated and widely spread in Europe, Longfellow learned that the King of Belgium thought this name "so suggestive of experiences in life" that he decided to have a seal cut with the name "Atchafalaya."⁴⁷

"Atchafalaya" and other place-names such as "Opelousas," "Bayou Plaquemine," "Attakapas," "Bayou Têche," "St. Maur," "St. Martin," "Natchitoches," and the "Spanish town of Adayes," all reminiscent of the "Eden of Louisiana," remained in the printed text. Longfellow's original manuscript contained still other names that never got into the printed text, such as the "Bayou Bon Dieu," and such lines as:

On the Bayou La Fourche and the Rivers Têche and Vermillion
and

Drains the Prairie Grand Cheveuil and the Lake Chetimaches.⁴⁸

PART II CANTO IV

On February 16, 1847, Longfellow began writing the last canto that needed to be filled in to complete his *Evangeline*. This was the Fourth Canto of the Second Part and, according to the original manuscript, was laid "Far in the distant West." On the next day, February 17, he made the following entry in his journal: "Wrote description of the Prairies for *Evangeline*."

For this canto dealing with the West, Longfellow again had a number of sources of information. Several months before actually writing this canto, he had written in his journal: "In the evening read Dr. Page's 'Prairiedom, or the New Estrémadura'."⁴⁹ Among Longfellow's books was a copy of this curious account of "Rambles and Scrambles" charmingly bound in grass-green and

⁴⁷ See letter of Charles Sumner to Longfellow, October 22, 1857.

⁴⁸ After *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto I, line 41 and Part II, Canto II, line 143.

⁴⁹ Longfellow's journal for April 11, 1846.

gold and containing an intricate map; but there seems to be little indication of his having made much use of this book.⁵⁰

Far more important for this canto dealing with Evangeline's wanderings in the West, was another book. Shortly before starting this canto Longfellow had written in his journal: "Read Frémont's 'Expedition to the Rocky Mountains in 1842'; highly interesting and exciting. What a wild life and what a fresh kind of existence! . . . Frémont has particularly touched my imagination and I trust something may come of that."⁵¹

On the very first page of this *Report*, Frémont mentioned among those who accompanied him, in addition to the famous Kit Carson, a certain "Basil Lajeunesse," about whom he had more to say two pages later on. Apparently this name struck Longfellow's attention and he decided to use it for Gabriel's father and to call Gabriel himself "Gabriel Lajeunesse." After coming upon this name in Frémont, then, he went back over his manuscript and added the word "Lajeunesse" at the appropriate places.

On three large sheets of paper Longfellow jotted down many brief references with their page numbers in Frémont's *Report*, which might suggest passages for his poem, and later checked off some of those that he used. In almost every line at the beginning of this Fourth Canto of the Second Part is to be found some echo of his reading in Frémont. In lines 5-8, the place-names "Oregon," "Walleway," "Owyhee," "Wild-River Mountain," "Sweet-Water Valley," "Fontaine-qui-bout"; in lines 14-16, the "purple amorphas," "the buffalo herds," "the elk," "the roebuck," "the wolves," and the "riderless horses"; and in line 25,

⁵⁰ *Prairiedom: Rambles and Scrambles in Texas or New Estrémadura*. By a Suthron. (Frederic Benjamin Page) (New York, 1845). This copy was given by Longfellow's daughters to the Harvard College Library on December 20, 1894.

⁵¹ Longfellow's journal for December 5 and 6, 1846. The full title of the book was: *Report of The Exploring Expedition to the Rocky Mountains in the Year 1842, and to Oregon and North California in the Years 1843-'44*, by Brevet Captain J. C. Frémont (Washington, 1845). The fly-leaf in the Harvard copy which Longfellow used reads: "The Library of the University from Edward Everett. Cambridge, 3 April 1846."

the "grim, taciturn bear" digging for roots: are all from Frémont.⁵² More important, in lines 36-90, the story of the Shawnee Indian woman whose husband, the Canadian Coureur-des-Bois, had been murdered, was also found in Frémont's *Report*.⁵³

The two Indian stories that Longfellow put into the mouth of this Shawnee woman, the tale of "Mowis, the bridegroom of snow who won and wedded a maiden,"⁵⁴ and "the tale of the fair Lilinau who was wooed by a phantom,"⁵⁵ were taken not from Frémont, but from Schoolcraft. Longfellow had taken Schoolcraft's *Travels* from the Harvard Library three years earlier; and Schoolcraft's later books, the *Algic Researches* and *Oneóta*, he had bought for his own library. *Oneóta* he apparently bought at this very time, for he put his signature and the date "1847" on the fly-leaf and checked in the table of contents and in the text not merely this tale of Mowis, but also several sections on "Scenes and Adventures in the Ozark Mountains," which gave Longfellow the setting for this canto in "this wonderful land at the base of the Ozark Mountains."⁵⁶ He also marked the two sections on "Corn Planting and its Incidents," which he used in the scene when the "maize was husked" and the "blood-red ear to Evangeline brought not her lover."⁵⁷

At about this time Longfellow also acquired the two large handsome green-bound and highly illustrated volumes of Catlin on the North American Indians, and in these volumes too he

⁵² Frémont, pp. 115, 127, 128; 14; and 114.

⁵³ Frémont, pp. 120-130.

⁵⁴ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 63-67. See Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Oneóta, or Characteristics of the Red Race of America* (New York, 1845), pp. 381-384.

⁵⁵ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 69-73. See Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Algic Researches, Comprising Inquiries respecting the Mental Characteristics of the North American Indians*, First Series, Indian Tales and Legends (New York, 1839), II, 77-84.

⁵⁶ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, line 29. See *Oneóta*, pp. 109-118; 173-178; 200-206.

⁵⁷ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 135-138. See *Oneóta*, pp. 81-87; 254-256. Longfellow later developed this theme still further in *The Song of Hiawatha* (Boston, 1855), Canto XIII "Blessing the Cornfields."

underscored a number of passages or marked them in the margins.⁵⁸

Indeed, since his early enthusiasm for Heckewelder's book on Indians,⁵⁹ his early poems on Indians,⁶⁰ and his representing the part of the American Indian in a college debate,⁶¹ Longfellow had had an interest in the "redskins." Accordingly it was natural to find Indian legends introduced into *Evangeline*. It is interesting to note, however, that here they are described as "savage marauders" and as "Ishmael's children, staining the desert with their blood"⁶² and that the nobler traits of the Indians were not yet as highly developed by Longfellow as they were a few years later in *The Song of Hiawatha*.

On February 18, 1847, Longfellow wrote in his journal: "Looked into Kip's *Early Jesuit Missions in North America*; a curious and very interesting book."⁶³ Five days later, on February 23, he added at the end of this Fourth Canto the account of Evangeline's journey in search of Gabriel to "the tents of the Jesuit Mission" and "the Black Robe Chief of the Mission,"⁶⁴ a passage clearly inspired by Longfellow's recent reading of Kip's book.

From the Jesuit Mission, Evangeline goes in search of Gabriel

⁵⁸ *Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians*. By Geo. Catlin. With Several Hundred Illustrations from the Author's Original Paintings (New York, 1842). In Mr. Longfellow's copy he has put his autograph on the fly-leaf of each volume with the date "1846."

⁵⁹ Longfellow's letter of November 9, 1823, to his mother, mentioning John Heckewelder's *Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations of Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States*.

⁶⁰ For example "The Indian Hunter," "Jeckoyva," "Lover's Rock," "Burial of the Minnisink."

⁶¹ Printed in *Every Other Saturday*, I, 20-21 (January 19, 1884). An account of the debate is also given by Longfellow's opponent, James W. Bradbury, in the *Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society*, 127-129 (February 27, 1882). Similar debates at Dartmouth College have been printed by Harold G. Rugg in *The Theatre Annual*, 1942, 55-70.

⁶² *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 18-23.

⁶³ *The Early Jesuit Missions in North America; Compiled and Translated from the Letters of the French Jesuits, with Notes*. By the Rev. William Ingraham Kip (New York, 1846).

⁶⁴ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 89-107. See also *The Song of Hiawatha* (Boston, 1855), Canto XXI "White Man's Foot."

to "the banks of the Saginaw River" in "the Michigan forests" and towards "the lakes of St. Lawrence."⁶⁵

By this time Longfellow had pretty well covered the American continent. Those who regretted that he did not lay the scene of his poem in the United States rather than in Nova Scotia, should remember that the larger part of the poem, Part the Second, is laid not in Nova Scotia, but in those regions of America which have become the United States.

According to Hawthorne's summary of the story as he heard it, the bride "wandered about New England all her life-time." As the poem developed in Longfellow's mind, however, he decided to widen the scope geographically, and extended the search along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to Louisiana, to the prairies of the West, and the forests of Michigan.

When he was only eighteen, Longfellow had written a "Hymn of the Moravian Nuns of Bethlehem;" and it is perhaps only natural that he should have balanced "the Tents of the Jesuit Mission" by having Evangeline journey also to the Gnadenhütten, "the Tents of Grace of the meek Moravian Missions."⁶⁶

The period of the American Revolution, 1775-1781, is hinted at only in a single line in which it is said that Evangeline was

Now in the noisy camps and the battle-fields of the army.⁶⁷

By the time we come to Philadelphia and the end of the poem, the action, as we have seen, has already reached the year 1793. In the duration of time, as well as in the extent of space, the scope of the poem was obviously much enlarged by Longfellow from the simple story as he had originally heard it.

Throughout all this Second Part of *Evangeline*, when she comes to the camp where Gabriel had been, only to find the smouldering ashes of the fire he had left behind when he departed, and in the various other occasions when she so narrowly missed finding him,

⁶⁵ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, lines 155-161.

⁶⁶ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, line 164.

⁶⁷ *Evangeline*, Part II, Canto IV, line 165.

we seem to hear what Longfellow called "the hoofbeats of fate," before which her heart shrinks until her heart finally ceases beating at the end of the poem. As in the First Part, the first four cantos led up to the tragedy of the debarkation and separation in the fifth canto; so in the Second Part, the first four cantos now lead up to the climax of reunion and death in the last canto.

THE EPILOGUE

On February 23, 1847, Longfellow wrote in his journal: "*Evangeline* is nearly finished. I shall complete it this week, together with my fortieth year." The latest date on the margin of the rough draft of the Fourth Canto of the Second Part is February 24, and since the Fifth and last Canto had already been written, there remained only what Longfellow in his manuscript called "The Epilogue," reverting once more to Nova Scotia and "the forest primeval." As Longfellow, on the eve of his fortieth birthday, sat by his fireside writing in pencil in the dark on the loose sheets the rough draft of this epilogue, he ended it by describing how the Acadians "repeat . . . *Evangeline's* story,"

While the great sea without reëchoes the mournful tradition.

He then added: "Half past Nine at Night. Feb. 26. 1847." The next morning, his birthday, standing at his desk by the window, he copied these lines in ink on the bluish paper, adding: "Finished February 27. 1847." In place, however, of the somewhat weak last line which he had jotted down in pencil the previous evening, he now substituted the splendidly resonant ending:

While from its rocky caverns the deep-voiced neighboring ocean
Speaks, and in accents disconsolate answers the wail of the forest.

CORRECTING THE PROOF SHEETS

Longfellow's journal for February 27, 1847 began:

Aujourd'hui j'ai quarante ans,
Une femme et deux enfans.

Evangeline is ended. I wrote the last lines this morning.

Yet labor on *Evangeline* was really still far from finished. On March 6, 1847, he wrote in his journal: "I began to revise and correct *Evangeline*, in order to have it ready for the press. Went carefully over the first canto." It was at this time that he no doubt made several of the last-minute changes that are to be found in the manuscript. By the end of the month, March 31, he wrote: "Got from the printer the first three pages of *Evangeline*." On April 3, he wrote in his journal:

The First Canto of *Evangeline* in proofs. Some of the lines need pounding; nails are to be driven in and clenched. On the whole I am pretty well satisfied. Fields came out in the afternoon. I told him of the poem; and he wants to publish it; thinking they can do as well with it as the Harpers.

Even after the poem was in proof, Longfellow was anxious to get the benefit of the suggestions of his friends. On April 4, he wrote: "Sumner and Felton came to tea; and we discussed the first Canto of *Evangeline*."

Longfellow apparently had four different sets of proof struck off: one to give to Sumner; one to give to Felton; one to give to Folsom; and a master set on which to make his own corrections. The first three sets are preserved in the Longfellow House and Longfellow wrote on the outside of the package: "Proof Sheets of '*Evangeline*' with comments of Folsom, Sumner, and Felton."

Charles Sumner's corrections, made in ink, were few, statesmanlike, and not too severe.

Professor Cornelius Conway Felton's corrections and suggestions, made in red or black pencil, were perhaps characteristic of a Greek scholar, who was a stickler for good classical hexameters. If by chance Longfellow had written a heptameter instead of a hexameter, Felton drew in red vertical lines marking the feet and added the comment: "One foot too many here" (page 96). He insisted that the dactyls should be intermingled with real spondees and not with trochees, and often challenged certain feet as "weak spondees" (page 71). Accustomed to unrhymed classical verse, he quite rightly objected to any accidental rhymes or

near rhymes, such as "peasant . . . incessant" (page 9), "brothers . . . others" (pages 50-51), or "lips . . . ships" (page 67); and Longfellow quite rightly always followed these suggestions of Felton, and as far as possible avoided these blemishes.

It was Charles Folsom, however, who was most severe. He was something of a martinet, having been an instructor of mathematics on Farragut's Flagship. At the University Press, his insistence on good printing earned him the title of "The Cambridge Aldus." As a librarian, first at Harvard and then at the Boston Athenæum, he developed what was called "a passion for minute and exact accuracy." He challenged almost everything that Longfellow had ventured to say in *Evangeline*. Did the primitive Acadians have glass in their windows? Did they have much silver? Was Longfellow's description of the flora and fauna mentioned in each passage right for that particular month of the year in that particular longitude? With such questions Folsom fairly covered the margins and the tops and bottoms of the pages of proof. On April 9, 1847, Longfellow wrote in his journal: "Proof-sheets of *Evangeline* all *tattooed* with Folsom's marks. How severe he is. But so much the better." Once, after Folsom had challenged a very minor point, he added disarmingly: "You see how much I am willing to hazard off-hand, willing to be found *all wrong*, if you will only come out *all right*." Longfellow came then to appreciate Folsom's criticisms no matter how carping they might seem. On April 23, he writes: "Proof-sheets from Folsom. Full of wise annotations and commentaries;" and on May 18: "Look over my proofs of *Evangeline*. Folsom's criticisms are minute and curious."

On July 1, 1847, Longfellow writes of a visit from the artist Thomas Buchanan Read and adds: "After dinner read him some passages from *Evangeline*." By July 26, however, he was still busy correcting the sheets for *Evangeline*; but soon afterwards that part of the task was at last completed and the work was ready to be printed. In his journal for September 4, Longfellow

wrote: "Ticknor paid me four hundred dollars for two thousand copies of *Evangeline*." Longfellow was now impatient to see the book printed and wrote on October 2: "Why does not Ticknor publish *Evangeline*? I am going to town to ask him that very question.—And his answer was that he should do so without further delay."

Evangeline IS PUBLISHED

Longfellow hoped that the copies of *Evangeline* might come to him from the publishers on Saturday, October 30, so that he might have them to give to a few relatives and friends who would be attending the christening of his daughter Fanny which was to take place that day. That morning Longfellow sent a note to Sumner saying: "The baby is to be christened this morning; so that the baby and the book will be published on the same day." For some reason, however, there seems to have been a slight further delay and the books did not arrive on Saturday, but only on Monday morning. Longfellow then dispatched them to those who had attended the christening as souvenirs of that occasion, inscribing them "October 30," the date when the christening had taken place.

On November 1, he also very naturally sent a copy to Nathaniel Hawthorne, remembering that it was Hawthorne who had so generously handed over the story to him. From Custom-House, Salem, Hawthorne wrote back on November 11, 1847:

I have read *Evangeline* with more pleasure than it would be decorous to express. It cannot fail, I think, to prove the most triumphant of all your successes. Everybody likes it. I wrote a notice of it for our democratic paper, which Conolly edits.

Conolly, to whom Longfellow had also sent a copy of the poem, sent Longfellow in return a copy of the *Salem Advertiser*, of November 13, 1847, containing Hawthorne's anonymous review of *Evangeline*. In this Hawthorne said very graciously:

It is a theme, indeed, not to be trusted in the hands of an ordinary writer who would bring out only its gloom and wretchedness; it required the true poet's

deeper insight to present it to us, as we find it here, its pathos all illuminated with beauty. . . . We remember no such triumph as the author has here achieved, transfiguring *Evangeline*, now old and gray, before our eyes, and making us willingly acquiesce in all the sorrow that has befallen her, for the sake of the joy which is prophesied and realized within her.⁶⁸

On November 29, Longfellow wrote to Hawthorne thanking him for having written in such a kindly way about the success of the poem and added:

This success I owe entirely to you, for being willing to forego the pleasure of writing a prose tale, which many people would have taken for poetry, that I might write a poem which many people take for prose.

The friendship between Hawthorne and Longfellow is perhaps the nearest equivalent we have in America to the friendship between Goethe and Schiller in Germany. Our closest parallel to Goethe's giving to Schiller the material for *Wilhelm Tell* and then praising Schiller for what he had done with it, is Hawthorne's handing over to Longfellow the story for *Evangeline*, and then so generously praising the poem that had been made out of the story.⁶⁹

"LA SUITE MERVEILLEUSE D'UN POÈME"

Not all the critics were as kindly as Hawthorne, and before long considerable controversy arose about the merits of *Evangeline* as poetry, about the historical truth of the story, and about Longfellow's sources of information.

In the course of the hundred years that have passed since *Evangeline* was first published, an extraordinary number of later editions and translations of *Evangeline* have been printed, not to mention innumerable books and articles about it and about. It is impossible, of course, to make any absolutely complete bibliog-

⁶⁸ It was this final scene in which the sadness of death is forgotten in the glory of reunion that Hawthorne, when his own death was near, asked his son to read aloud to him, adding very simply: "I like that." See Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne's letter of July 24, 1864, to Longfellow.

⁶⁹ A fuller discussion of this relationship will be given in a book now in preparation by Manning Hawthorne and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana, *Hawthorne and Longfellow: The Story of a Literary Friendship*.

raphy of *Evangeline*. It can safely be said, however, that over two hundred and seventy different editions, with and without illustrations, and with and without introductions, commentaries and notes, have kept the interest in the poem alive. At least one hundred and thirty translations have spread the knowledge of the poem around the world and stimulated discussion about its subject overseas. Dramatizations,⁷⁰ musical settings,⁷¹ an *opéra-bouffe*,⁷² and various film versions⁷³ gave the story further currency.

As the story of Nala and Damayanti in the *Mahabharata* became in Oriental literature the prototype of the story of a beautiful bride searching for her husband; so its counterpart in the western world, *Evangeline*, led to other stories along the same line.⁷⁴

During the century since *Evangeline* was published, more than two hundred and fifty books and articles have appeared dealing with the subject. The question of the Expulsion of the Acadians in 1755 has constantly been brought up anew and when in 1955, the two-hundredth anniversary of that event is commemorated, there bids fair to be still further discussion of the rights and wrongs of what the Acadians call "Le Grand Dérangement." This dispersal has been linked with other cases of expulsion, deportations, exiles, and displaced persons. During the last half of the nineteenth century and still more during the first half of the

⁷⁰ For example, Robert N. Traver, *Evangeline: A Drama in Five Acts*, Albany, 1878; William King Baker, *Gabriel Lajeunesse: A Dramatic Poem* (London, 1922); Thomas William Broadhurst, *Evangeline: A Play* (London, 1926).

⁷¹ For example, J. R. Thomas, *Evangeline* (New York, 1855); Joseph Sieboth, *Evangeline* (New York, 1858); John Blockley, *Evangeline* (London, n.d.); Will S. Hays, *Evangeline* (Cleveland, 1862); Charles O. Banks, *Evangeline: Suite for Organ* (New York, 1924); Italian Opera by Francesco Marcacci (Venice, 1932).

⁷² J. Cheever Goodwin and Edward E. Rice, *Evangeline: Opera Bouffe* (Boston, 1877).

⁷³ For example, Finis Fox, *Evangeline: A Movie*, starring Dolores del Rio.

⁷⁴ See E. Burnouf, *Nala, épisode du Mahâbhârata* (Nancy, 1856). For stories of exiled Acadians similar to *Evangeline*, see Napoléon Bourassa's novel, *Jacques et Marie*, 1866, and the play of the same name based on it by George Morlaix; Charles G. D. Roberts, *A Sister to Evangeline: Being the Story of Yvonne de Lamourie* (Boston, 1898); the story of Emmeline Labiche and Louis Arceneaux given in Felix Voorhies, *Acadian Reminiscences* (New Iberia, Louisiana, 1907), pp. 81-90.

twentieth century, there has been much written on the "Survivance Acadienne"⁷⁵ on the survival and revival of the Acadian people—on "L'Acadie Vivante."⁷⁶ In all this activity one cannot deny the extraordinary influence of Longfellow's poem. As an indication of this influence, an important French book on Longfellow's *Evangeline* carries the significant subtitle: "La Suite Merveilleuse d'un Poème."⁷⁷

A political as well as a literary controversy has raged on the relative guilt of the victors and the victims, of the English and the French, of the Protestants and the Catholics. In all this argument, *Evangeline* has served as a sort of symbol. The descendants of the Acadians have used as a rallying cry for the title of their newspaper, *La Voix d'Évangéline*.⁷⁸ Statues of *Evangeline* have been erected in Nova Scotia and in Louisiana.⁷⁹ In 1930 a delegation of some fifty "Evangelines" from Louisiana, wearing "Evangeline Costumes," made a pilgrimage to Nova Scotia. In the following year, 1931, there was a return pilgrimage of "Evangelines" from Nova Scotia, to Louisiana.⁸⁰

As the Centenary of the publication of *Evangeline* approaches, the number and bulk of books dealing with the Expulsion of the Acadians has, if anything, increased. In 1945 a French scholar

⁷⁵ Antoine Bernard, *Histoire de la Survivance Acadienne* (Montreal, 1936).

⁷⁶ Antoine Bernard, *L'Acadie Vivante* (Montreal, 1945). See also Émile Lauvrière, *La Tragédie d'un Peuple* (Paris, 1924, 2 volumes).

⁷⁷ Ernest Martin, *L'Évangéline de Longfellow et la Suite Merveilleuse d'un Poème* (Paris, 1936).

⁷⁸ This paper was originally called *L'Évangéline* and was founded in 1887 at Weymouth, Nova Scotia. It was later transferred to Moncton, New Brunswick, where it was published as a daily paper in 1931.

⁷⁹ In front of the Acadian Chapel at Grand Pré in Nova Scotia is a statue of *Evangeline* standing erect with her head thrown back. Beside the church at St. Martinville in Louisiana is a seated statue of *Evangeline*. A statuette by E. T. Kuntz of Longfellow seated with a bust of *Evangeline* at his side is in the Longfellow House in Cambridge. A bas-relief of *Evangeline* is included in the monument by Daniel Chester French in Longfellow Park, opposite the Longfellow House.

⁸⁰ Dudley J. LeBlanc, *The True Story of the Acadians* (Lafayette, Louisiana, 1937), pp. 220-256, describes both pilgrimages and gives pictures of the "Evangelines" on both occasions.

published his fifth book on the Acadians.⁸¹ In 1946 there appeared the sixth volume of a monumental work in English covering this period.⁸² Other works are in preparation. The end is not yet.

⁸¹ Antoine Bernard, *L'Acadie Vivante* (Montreal, 1945).

⁸² Lawrence Henry Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, Vol. VI. *The Great War for the Empire, the Years of Defeat, 1754-1757* (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1946). Samuel Eliot Morison, in his review of the book in *The New England Quarterly*, XX, 117-121 (March, 1947), points out the part played in the popular appraisal of the removal of the Acadians, by Longfellow's *Evangeline*.

A Bibliographical Footnote: "Long" and "Lo"

By CARROLL A. WILSON

THE bibliography of *Evangeline* has only one point that creates any difficulty, but that one point has caused as much discussion as if it were fifty points.

The first edition is what the period would call a "neat 12mo.," with title-page dated 1847, bound in either grey (call it buff if you wish) or yellow glazed boards (the color makes no difference), with a paper label on the spine, providing your copy has enough of the spine remaining for a label to stick to, and either without inserted publishers' ads., or with ads. tipped in, or with ads. sewed in (again it makes no difference).¹ Every copy of the first edition is dated 1847 on the title-page, and no copy of a second or later edition is so dated.² All these later copies *read*, on the title-page, "second edition," "third edition," etc., up to the tenth, which is the latest I have seen, save only the large-paper copies, dated 1848, which, having been sandwiched between the named fifth and sixth editions, wisely make no attempt to say on the title-page what edition they are.

The point which has caused all the discussion is the state of the text on line 1 of page 61. It should read: "Long within had been spread the snow-white," and so reads on approximately one to two per cent of the first edition. In the remainder a printer's disaster has taken place, and the line reads: "Lo within had," etc., the missing letters cut out as cleanly as with a knife, just as if two incisors had been smashed out of an upper jaw. Without benefit of quotes or italics, I shall call the rare examples Long copies, and the dentally defective but more common ones Lo copies, in this footnote.

It did not take much investigation in the early days to show, as will here appear more fully, that the Long copies must be the earliest printed, since the Lo error continued through subsequent editions, but the owners of Lo copies—constituting, be it remembered, 98 to 99% of the first edition—had paid good money for something now being relegated to a secondary position, and they became noisy about it. Their argument had two branches, first, that it was impossible for so glaring an error to have persisted for so many months, and, second, that all of Longfellow's early presentations were Lo copies, which clinched the matter. These are weighty arguments, not to be dismissed lightly. Let us "look at the record."

¹ Personally I should prefer a grey boards copy with no ads., but I would not say that one in yellow boards with ads. sewn in did not have equal primacy. Cf. a Nov. 1, 1847 copy later described.

² Barring the question of forgery, the best account of which is in Richard Curle, *Collecting American First Editions*, Indianapolis, 1930, pp. 41-43. There are some other things which the forger of *Evangeline* has got to look out for, but they are not material to this inquiry.

I

Years ago, when this matter was first being considered, I had thought it of great importance that at Craigie House, the Longfellow home at Cambridge, Massachusetts, there exist three sets of galley proofs of *Evangeline*, in each of which the words "long within" appear clearly and sharply. Upon reflection, however, these proofs seem unimportant. These galleys, three columns to a page, were obtained by Longfellow, somewhat hesitant with his first full-length poem, and in an unusual meter, for correction and suggestion by his friends Felton, Folsom and Sumner.³ To a certain extent they are successive, corrections in one proof being sometimes made in another, but it is certain that none of them was the proof which went to the printer, much less the proof from the stereotype plates which came back to Longfellow for final examination before printing. Also, the vital line in these proofs is line three on page 61, not line one, showing that press-work was still to be done. No, these proofs, although of the greatest interest in showing the development of the poem and in other ways—almost worth an article in themselves⁴—are of no meaning bibliographically.

Let us now try to state with some accuracy for what period the Lo error persisted, if for no other reason because the prior accounts are full of errors. The Ticknor cost books are now available to scholarship at Harvard University, and give us a variety of information supplementing in many ways the less clear record at Craigie House.

These cost books lump together the first two editions of *Evangeline*. They show that 2100 copies were printed of the first and second editions, of which Longfellow had 100, and give a publication date of November 1, 1847.⁵

The third edition was 1100 copies, of which 50 were for Longfellow, ordered November 17, 1847,⁶ and published December 6. The fourth was 1000 copies,

³ He finished the poem on February 27, 1847, and got his first pages from the printer on March 31. At the end Ticknor delayed somewhat and did not order the poem printed until October 2.

⁴ Folsom was the keenest and most useful critic of the three. For example, the proofs read, describing Benedict's house: "Sycamore grew by the door, with a mistletoe wreathing around it." Folsom asks on the margin if the mistletoe grows that far north, and says that in the South it is "rather pendant than weaving." Longfellow changes the line (last l. p. 15) to: "with a woodbine wreathing around it." Longfellow wrote in his Journal on May 9: "Proof-sheets of *Evangeline* all *tatoood* with Folsom's marks. How severe he is. But so much the better." At this point Folsom was chief reader at the University Press.

⁵ The publication date of the first edition will be discussed later. Longfellow's note-book record of copies of his books reads "500 500 500 500," thus giving us four impressions instead of two, which must fall before the physical state of the books that have survived—only first editions dated 1847 and second editions dated 1848. A copy of the second edition was presented by Longfellow over the date November 13.

⁶ In his Journal on November 13 Longfellow writes "The third thousand of *Evangeline*." He presented a copy of the third edition over the date November 22. Livingston's edition numeration (*A Bibliography . . .*, etc., New York, privately

ordered January 10, 1848, and published January 24. The second, third and fourth editions all read Lo.

(It is at this point that the error is caught, and Lo becomes Long, so that the subsequent editions are less important. The next three are—the fifth, 1000 copies, ordered February 25, 1848, and published March 8; the unnumbered large paper edition, ordered April 3, 50 copies; and the sixth, 1000 copies, ordered April 8, 1848, and published April 20.)

This gives us, then, something over four thousand copies containing the horrid toothless Lo error, viz:

98 to 99% of the first edition and all of the second edition, together	2100 copies	2080
The third edition, entire		1100
The fourth edition, entire		1000
Total copies		4180

This is a substantial number of copies, and the error lasted from November 1, 1847, at least until the ordering of the fifth edition on February 25, 1848—four months. How could this have been?

"How" perhaps is immaterial, in view of the fact that it *did* happen and they do all read Lo, but there is a very good reason, for this particular book, why it could have happened. Who calls attention to errors in printed books? Readers? Not so much as you would think. Primarily three people—publisher, printer, and (above all) author.

For *Evangeline*, however, the publisher and printer had no slightest interest in the text. Recollect, as Mr. Charvat has told us in our PAPERS,⁷ that for *Evangeline*, as for later books, the books were printed from plates, and Longfellow owned the plates. If Mr. Ticknor thought the market justified a new edition of 1000 copies, he must ask Longfellow for an order on Metcalf & Co., to print those thousand copies from Longfellow's plates. (For which use of the plates Longfellow received from Ticknor twenty cents a copy when *printed*, in addition to his royalty when sold—a rather good businessman!) The type was not theirs, the layout was not theirs; printer and publisher had not the usual craftsman's interest in detecting or correcting errors.

As for Longfellow, I cannot prove it, but I have no slightest doubt that the proofs (from the plates) received by him read Long. Anybody can be excused—and let us hope that the editor of these PAPERS sometimes is—for missing a transposed letter, a dropped consonant, an error in capitalization or punctuation. But these are not obvious errors, compared to a great white hole in the black type-area! It is unthinkable to me that Longfellow would have missed that sort of error, if

printed 1908) is wrong, and must fall before the accurate information from these cost-books.

⁷ William Charvat, "Longfellow's Income from his Writings, 1840-1852," PAPERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, XXXVIII, 9-21 (1944).

it had been there at that time. Particularly unthinkable, because these plates are just about as beautiful a piece of printing as one could look for—I could find no typographical error of any sort in the 163 pages of the poem, and the printing looked just as clear and sharp in the sixth edition, which was the last one I looked at, as in the first.

But why didn't Longfellow discover the error when the book came out? He immediately on publication annexed as his own (at Craigie House) a copy in grey boards, unfortunately undated, and went through it carefully enough to indicate some 20 changes in substance and upwards of 50 changes in punctuation which he wished made in some later copy. The answer is easy. By some trick of fortune, he used for the purpose of this careful examination a Long copy. His copy simply did not have the error, so there was no reason why he should find it, and we do not know to this day when it was discovered, in time for that fifth edition ordered February 25, 1848.

It is of no good, also, to present the argument that the error might have been caught just at the end of the first edition, and then forgotten about, so that the second, third and fourth editions unwittingly continued it. In the first place, such a sequence of facts is so preposterous as almost never to occur; in the second, an error once corrected is in printing practice always thereafter carefully watched; and in the third place, as will appear, the few presentation Long copies which we know about are all dated in very early November, 1847, and not just as the second edition is coming out.

I think the above demonstrates conclusively that copies of the first edition of *Evangeline* reading Long were those first printed, and I now pass to the more serious objection of the Lo school.

II

This argument is that all the early Longfellow presentations are Lo copies, therefore Lo copies must be the first copies. But let us cut away some underbrush. What do those weasel words "first copies" mean? "First copies *published*," of course. We must keep this clear. Nothing in the events of October and November can vitiate the claim of the Long copies to have been first *printed*, and our inquiry now becomes the equally important one as to which of the two forms of the first edition of *Evangeline* reached the public first.⁸ Again we must "look at the record."

Here again the Lo adherents have had it all their own way. I have not looked it up fully, but I do not know of any Long dated presentation *Evangeline* advertised in any dealer's catalogue, or listed in any auction or other list within my memory. After all, plain or inscribed, there are not so many Long copies about of

⁸ This question of "printed" vs. "published" seems a fairly obvious thought, but it had not occurred to me until Norman L. Dodge stated it in an article in *The Month at Goodspeed's*, April, 1947, describing an October 30 Lo copy. Indeed, Mr. Dodge's article was the stimulus which led to this footnote.

any sort. This footnote will list you four such dated presentations, all of which have been for many years far from the marts of commerce and, so far as I know, have not been publicly reported hitherto.

The Ticknor cost books say that *Evangeline* was published November 1, 1847. Longfellow's Journal says October 30. The Journal, as is shown by the *Boston Evening Transcript* and other sources, is correct. So on October 30 a small package of books came out to Craigie House from Ticknor, and Longfellow proceeded to distribute them—to the strangest possible assortment of presentees. Not to his close friends, Felton, Hillard, Prescott, Motley, Fields and the like, but to six ladies, two of whom could have been scarcely more than bowing acquaintances, and a third who appears nowhere else in the Longfellow canon.

For October 30 was famous for quite another reason at Craigie House—the christening of Longfellow's daughter Fanny⁹ that morning, and these persons seem to be those who stayed on after the ceremony. They are:

First and most gallantly, Longfellow's wife;
His sister, Mrs. Mary L. Greenleaf;
Her mother-in-law, Mrs. S. Greenleaf;
Mrs. (Convers) Francis, and
Mrs. (Andrews) Norton,

wives respectively of the professor of pulpit eloquence and pastoral care at the Harvard Divinity School, and of the former Dexter Professor of Sacred Literature at the same school; their husbands presumably officiated at the christening and were asked to stay to lunch with their wives; and

Mrs. Hilary B. Cenas,

of whom history, the Longfellow records, and anything I can trace, are silent. I like to think that she was little Fanny's nurse.

Six of them,¹⁰ all in grey boards (the Norton copy has been rebound) without ads., and *all reading Lo*.

There is no recorded presentation copy on the next day, Sunday, October 31. Spiritually, it was the Sabbath, and Longfellow drove into town for a particular sermon; practically, the Cambridge post-office probably wasn't open on Sundays in 1847.

Monday, November 1. Longfellow writes in his Journal: "College day, filled to the brim with work, and no rest till nine at night." Nevertheless he finds time late at night to date and send the most desirable presentation of all, that to Haw-

⁹ Fanny Longfellow, born April 7, 1847, was the first child ever delivered "in this part of the world" (Longfellow's expression in a letter to his mother of April 8) with the assistance of ether, Dr. W. T. G. Morton himself superintending its use. She died September 11, 1848.

¹⁰ There is at Craigie House a seventh copy, rebound in the uniform style which Longfellow used for the copies in which he pencilled his dates of composition, etc., but it would have taken some time to bind this book, so I cannot be sure that the "Oct. 30" written on it was written on that date. It reads *Lo*.

thorne, in grey boards without ads., and one to Sumner,¹¹ which has been rebound. *The two read Lo.*

November 2. No presentations.

November 3. To Lowell. The first Longfellow copy presented in yellow boards. No ads. Lo.

November 4. No presentations.

November 5. Longfellow gets around to the Portland relatives. He sends grey boards copies, without ads., to his father, to Anne Sophia Longfellow, to his brother Alexander, and to Eliza A. Potter, his first wife's sister, with whom he remained on very friendly terms throughout his life. The first two are Lo, but the last two are Long. Our first Long dated presentations!

Well, say the Lo champions, isn't this enough? In six days before November 5, before you come to *any* dated Long copies, you have shown us nine—all that you can record—all reading Lo. What more do we want to prove that Lo copies were published first?

To this I shall not say that if I go through November 5 the score is 11 to 2, not at all despicable in view of the facts that ordinary Lo copies are as 50 to 1. I can only point out that we have *not* looked at *all* the record. We have combed Craigie House, and made sure about the copies at Harvard and Bowdoin and the New York Public Library, and of one or two private collectors, but there are many other places where Longfellow collections can be found—and many other people, such as Ticknor and Metcalf the printer, who got early copies. Let us scurry about as much as we can, in view of the fact that this footnote must be written before the 100th anniversary on October 30, 1947, and see what we can find.

A very little scurrying produces some interesting results. An overlooked copy in an Eastern institution shows that Longfellow, on November 3, giving a Lo copy to Lowell, was also presenting a Long copy to Edward Everett (now rebound). Still more exciting is a yellow glazed boards copy, with ads., reading Long, inscribed: "Sarah M. Adams from James T. Fields Nov. 1st 1847,"¹² with advertisements. We are now back to November 1 again, and the score of known dated presented copies for the first week of publication is now 11 of the common Lo copies to four of the uncommon Longs, and these four do not include the undated Long copy which Longfellow used for his corrections. In my judgment we can forget that Ticknor included only Lo copies in the package which went to the christening party, and can hypothesize with some confidence that publication of the two variations was simultaneous.

I conclude therefore, as follows, as a summary of the evidence for the first hundred years: "The copies of the first edition of *Evangeline* reading Long were those first printed, but copies reading Lo and Long were published at the same time."

¹¹ I have no record of the Folsom and Felton copies.

¹² Of course, as previously stated, these early Long presentations completely dispose of the argument that the break to Lo might have occurred late in the printing of the first edition.

Book Distribution in Mid-Nineteenth Century America

Illustrated by the Publishing Records of
Ticknor and Fields, Boston

By W. S. TRYON*

STUDY of the American book trade in the nineteenth century has been greatly hampered by a lack of available first-hand information. Especially unknown are the records and correspondence of the publishing houses, although their archives contain highly informative material. Most contemporary publishers, lacking their usual flair for publicity, have mysteriously discouraged research in these accumulations. However, a refreshing change is manifested by a recent decision of the Houghton Mifflin Company of Boston, which has bestowed all the existing records of its predecessors, Ticknor and Fields,¹ on the Houghton Library of Harvard.

This material consists of a dozen volumes of Cost Books, giving in detail the processes of manufacture; ten volumes of Letter Books, comprising well over eight thousand letters by the firm; and a variety of Journals, Commission Books, and Day Books. It is a collection, unique and of many riches, and from it the facts of this paper have been largely drawn.

While the records of almost any publishing house in the nine-

* Read at the meeting of the Society in New York, June 13, 1947.

¹ For brevity and convenience, the designation "Ticknor and Fields," the name by which the firm was best known, has been used throughout this paper. Actually it was organized, through successive years, under various names: Allen and Ticknor, 1832-1834; William D. Ticknor, 1834-1843; William D. Ticknor and Co., 1843-1849; Ticknor, Reed and Fields, 1849-1854; and Ticknor and Fields, 1854-1868.

teenth century would contain information of social value, those of Ticknor and Fields have special importance. In the first place, its records, and particularly its correspondence, suggest that in its growth, exploitation of the literary market and business practices, Ticknor and Fields was typical of many of the major houses in Boston, New York or Philadelphia. We can be sure that the facts about Ticknor and Fields are, in general, the facts about all the leading, successful firms of the day.

On the other hand, because of the uncommon nature of the Ticknor and Fields' trade list, this house wrote a unique chapter in the history of American civilization. Ticknor and Fields was never the largest firm in the United States, either in the number of books it published or in the volume of its business. Lippincott in Philadelphia, the Harpers in New York, Little and Brown in Boston, all surpassed it. Its achievements are better weighed than counted. In the field of belles-lettres—in fiction, poetry and essays—it had no rival. It nurtured a native authorship and diffused the best of English literature to the American public as did no other publishing house in the nation. There is no need to belabor the point. It was, by 1860, the publisher of Hawthorne, Holmes, Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, Emerson, Thoreau, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Dickens, Thackeray, De Quincey, Matthew Arnold, Kingsley, Thomas Hughes, Browning, Tennyson and Charles Reade, to say nothing of a host of lesser, but once famous, literary lights.²

The establishment of Ticknor and Fields as a book house in 1832 coincided with a swift transformation which, under the impact of the industrial revolution, was overtaking American society. The book trade, like all other business undertakings, felt the full force of the change. Some of its members, who were un-

² Due to the lack of an international copyright law, this statement, of course, does not mean that Ticknor and Fields was the exclusive publisher of all the English authors named. Any American publisher could appropriate their works, and many did, but in most cases the English writers regarded the Boston house at least as their authorized publishers even though the claim could not be enforced at law.

able or did not sense the need for adjustment, were overtaken speedily by failure and bankruptcy. Others, like Ticknor and Fields, proved adaptable. There were many problems, of course; but no problem demanded a solution more urgently than that of an adequate distribution of books.³ No matter what excellencies might be possessed by a bookseller, if he could not find markets in which to sell his books, his whole enterprise came to an end. And what efficient distribution of books meant to the state of American culture hardly needs to be pointed out. Ticknor and Fields, like all successful publishers, found themselves in part caught by methods inherited from the past, which they gradually discarded as their obsolete character yearly became more evident, while at the same time they acquired new techniques which they brought under control as best they could or as the exigencies of the situation demanded. It may be well, first, to observe these older practices prevalent before 1830, and to indicate the extent of their survival under the changed conditions of the book trade between 1830 and 1860.

In 1830 the bulk of any publisher's output was still disposed of, as it had been for a hundred years previously, in the local market. The transition of American society to literacy, urbanization and mass production, was not yet complete, nor were the revolutionary changes in transportation as yet developed. This state of affairs was especially true of the Boston book trade. What Mr. Ferris Greenslet has called New England's Periclean Age was just beyond the horizon; habits were more conservative; and, in any event, primacy in the book trade was still lodged in the intellectual capital of the nation, Philadelphia.

For these restricted local markets the number of books required to meet the demand was not very great. For example, Ticknor

³ Naturally, in selling books, their "promotion" is a closely connected corollary of their distribution; that, however, is a topic in itself and would go too far afield for the allotted space of this paper. In the case of Ticknor and Fields, the "promotion" of their books was unique, and a chief reason for their significant position in American cultural history.

published only a handful of new titles and new editions in any given year; the size of these editions was likewise small, and his total annual publications added up to approximately only 12,000 volumes.⁴ Indeed, the entire value of Ticknor's stock, wholesale and retail, was only \$10,000,⁵ in 1835. Most of it he sold over his own counters in the Old Corner Bookstore, for the low discount rates furnish further evidence of the slight interchange of books between publishers and booksellers. This discount was almost never higher than twenty, or occasionally twenty-five per cent, and was often as low as ten, and even five per cent.⁶ However the matter is regarded, it is clearly evident that this condition was the result of a society which did not read, or at least buy, many books, except locally; which had never heard of mass production, and because of the insurmountable problem of transportation, could not have practised it, if it had.

Of course the publisher, even after the railways and steam-boats provided him with a national market, always leaned heavily on his local sales. Looking ahead for a moment: in 1854, out of Ticknor and Fields' first edition of Mrs. Otis' *The Barclays of Boston*, in 3,000 volumes, 900 of these went to the Boston booksellers; in October, 1858, out of the first three editions of *The Courtship of Miles Standish*, in 20,280 volumes, 5,000 went to the Boston booksellers.⁷ It was not that the local market disappeared or even declined, in an absolute sense, in the 'forties and 'fifties,

⁴ *E.g.*, in 1835, Ticknor published 16 new titles and new editions. Of these, the size of the edition in the case of four is not known, though altogether they probably numbered 3,000 volumes. Of the known twelve, one title was an edition of 2,000 copies; one of 1,500; eight of 1,000; and two of 500; a total of 12,500. W. S. Tryon and William Charvat, *Cost Books of Ticknor and Fields and their Predecessors, 1832-58*, A12 to A16, now in process of publication.

⁵ *Assessment and Taxation Books*, Mss. in Boston City Hall, 1835. For the meaning of the values given, see Justin Winsor, *Memorial History of Boston* (Boston, 1881), III, 234, and note 3.

⁶ *Cost Books*, *op. cit.*, entries from 1832 to 1840, *passim*.

⁷ Ticknor and Fields, *Letter Books, Domestic*, to B. Bradley & Co., Boston, March 3, 1854, Vol. V, p. 288; to S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago, October 18, 1858, Vol. VII, p. 649. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

so much as that it lost its relative importance. Instead of selling practically all of an edition locally as in the 'thirties, it will be observed that twenty years later only one-third or one-fourth the amount was locally distributed.

When books were sold outside the immediate neighborhood before 1830, two principal methods were employed: selling by subscription, and selling by a traveling agent. These practices were chiefly utilized by the larger publishing houses, especially those in Philadelphia, but they were characteristic wherever books were sold into rural areas, which meant most of the United States. Essentially it was a system where the functions of the publisher and the bookseller were not sharply differentiated. In effect it meant that the publisher was also acting as a bookseller and sought to reach the individual buyer of his books without the "middleman." Neither of these methods was used extensively by Ticknor and Fields because by the 1840's, when the firm was large enough to seek markets outside the local Boston area, specialization of function had commenced and more up-to-date techniques for book distribution had rendered them nearly obsolete.

Looking first at the selling of books by subscription, it is clear it was particularly popular for works for which the sale might be limited, were expensive to manufacture, or ran into many volumes, such as Bibles, encyclopedias, lengthy poems, and scientific treatises. Since the names of subscribers were often printed in the book, the personal vanity of the purchaser might be counted on to enlarge the publisher's profit.

Only subscribe John Andrews, Esq. [the prospective buyer] pretty close to [the name of] General Washington or Dr. Franklin and you may charge at least 50 per cent more than you otherwise would for the books.

So wrote one enterprising bookseller to a publisher.⁸ Often the publisher felt, sometimes erroneously, that a subscription list made his estimates of prospective expenses more reliable.

⁸E. L. Bradsher, *Matthew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher* (New York, 1912), p. 18.

For so considerable an enterprise,

wrote the publisher S. G. Goodrich about an edition of Trumbull's poems,

I took the precaution to get up a subscription . . . but [the work] did not come up to the public expectation . . . and more than half the subscribers declined taking the work.⁹

Ticknor and Fields experimented with this method of distribution only once, and then not until 1857 when it was pretty well going out of use. In that year they embarked upon an elaborate Household Edition of Scott's *Waverley Novels*, in fifty volumes. Great care was taken in its manufacture. A special, high-grade paper was purchased from the Boston paper dealers, Tileston and Hollingsworth; a greenish bronze cloth for binding was imported from London, as were also a series of vignettes, engraved on steel; and for the leather bindings William Mathews in New York was secured. The scale and the cost of the undertaking were far greater than anything the House had previously engaged in; fearful to trust entirely to the ordinary channels of sales, it embarked upon a subscription list for safety.

The manner of the arrangement is indicated by a letter to F. S. Saxton, who was engaged to find subscribers:

Let this be the understanding between us in regard to taking subscriptions for the *Waverley Novels*. You are to send us the names, as you procure them, collecting from the subscribers one dollar and fifty cents for the first two volumes of the series. You must send with their names, one dollar for each name, retaining for yourself fifty cents.¹⁰

Thereafter the publishers were to send two volumes each month to the subscriber and fifty cents to the bookseller who obtained the subscription. This amounted to a thirty-three and one-third per cent discount, really better than average, as the publishers pointed out to D. M. Dewey, of Rochester, New York, for "when you

⁹ S. G. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime* (New York and Auburn, 1857), II, 111.

¹⁰ *Letter Books, Domestic*, *op. cit.*, February 14, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 633.

get one subscriber, it secures a sale of 48 volumes which makes a very good business."¹¹

There is no doubt that the business portion of the transaction would have been a success if unforeseen difficulties had not arisen. The first edition of *Waverley* was sold out on the day of publication, and subsequent issues were increased in number. But the panic of 1857 put an end to all rosy hopes. Subscribers fell off or failed to continue their subscriptions. Putnam, who had taken a special edition of two hundred sets—10,000 volumes—went bankrupt. The number of Mathews' fine leather bindings was severely curtailed.¹² As though the publishers' woes were insufficient, complaints came in that, despite the elegant format, the proof-reading was faulty.¹³ The truth was that the publishers would have been better advised had they employed the new techniques of distribution—which we shall examine shortly—for the subscription method was unsafe and had been for more than twenty years.

A more colorful, and equally effective, method of distributing books to the public before 1830 had been through personal book agents hired by the publishers to peddle their wares along the countryside. It, too, arose in a nation which was without means of communication, an educated citizenry, or urban centres acting as points of distribution; and would, of course, decline when the causes which gave rise to the system changed.

A long line of individuals, like Parson Weems, of the filio-pietistic biographies and the story of the cherry tree, swarmed through the back country, hawking the output of the Philadelphia and New York presses. The primitive character of the situa-

¹¹*Ibid.*, February 19, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 643.

¹²*Ibid.*, to D. Appleton & Co., March 12, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 684; to L. Merriam, Springfield (?), March 13, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 687; to G. P. Putnam, New York, February 14, 1857, Vol. VI, pp. 626-627; to Wm. Mathews, New York, October 19, 1857, Vol. VII, p. 132.

¹³R. G. White to J. T. Fields, August 25, 1858, Fields Collection, Huntington Library.

tion, as well as the tribulations of the agent, appear in this portion of a letter addressed by one of them to his employer, Carey, in Philadelphia in 1817. He was engaged at the moment in selling a work on botany by a Dr. B.

You may compare my business to water running down hill, but let me tell you it would be more just if you compared it to a shad climbing a pine tree. In the first place there isn't more than 1 to 500 who knows what Botany is, that one you've to search for (once in three mos. you may find him *unengaged* at home) then you have to convince him of the utility of an *American* production of this kind . . . after put down his prejudices against subscription & at last wait the will & pleasure of his *whole* family (when composed of girls more easy) and should success attend you, you in verity git *one* whole subscriber!¹⁴

How far the Boston publishers used the book agent to distribute books is not clear, but they certainly did not resort to the system so extensively as their Philadelphia and New York brethren. Ticknor and Fields' correspondence shows that, while they persistently denied any employment of agents,¹⁵ they did use them, though only sparingly and under special circumstances.

A number of examples will serve as illustration. Now and then they employed the author to sell his own works, particularly when they were textbooks, as when they offered William Russell a hundred copies of his *Vocal Culture* at half price to dispose of in 1848.¹⁶ For districts ill-equipped with bookstores, such as the Maritime Provinces, an agent was hired to distribute their volumes.¹⁷ Clergymen, eking out their salaries, were sometimes commissioned with religious works, intended to preserve intact a certain amount of dignity to the transaction. Such was the *Memoirs of Mrs. Hamlin*, of which the Reverend Mr. Hervey of Worcester undertook to dispose in 1853. Though it was a volume so tedious that not even the hardest reader could plough through it

¹⁴ Bradsher, *Matthew Carey, op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹⁵ Many letters express this point of view. *E.g.*, *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Reverend H. Colman, Salem, January 13, 1849, Vol. I, pp. 281-282.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, to Wm. Russell, Medford, July 19, 1848, Vol. I, p. 72.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, to F. W. Kellogg, October 11, 1848, Vol. I, p. 183.

today, he seems to have met with success. At least he was back for more religious literature in 1855, this time given Mrs. Judson's writings, volumes even more pious—and more tedious.¹⁸ Whether they represented college professors, bent on the same financial mission as the clergy, or students, "working their way through college," has not been determined, but E. P. Roberts and E. N. Manley, of Williams College, were given summer agencies to sell Mrs. Judson's works.¹⁹ In the 'fifties, "remainders" were also disposed of, at liberal discounts, through agents.²⁰ Once a purely literary work was entrusted to an agent. In 1857, Mortimer Warren, of New Britain, Connecticut—where significantly Ticknor and Fields had no bookselling outlet—was offered the just published Blue and Gold edition of Whittier's *Poetical Works*.²¹ For whatever reason the offer was made, it was not renewed.

Only once did the firm, deliberately and extensively, engage in selling through agents. The occasion was the Republican campaign of 1856. While the partners had an undoubted enthusiasm for the Republican candidate, which is today a little difficult to understand, their zeal was more comprehensively whetted by the fact that they were the publishers of his official campaign biography, Upham's *Life of Frémont*. The volume has an interesting history which can only be traced here as it throws light on the agency business. Some 50,000 copies were printed and agents hired to distribute the volumes. To Joseph Parker, in Norwalk, Ohio, they gave an exclusive market, and with a true promoter's zeal told him they expected he would sell 100,000 copies.²²

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, to Reverend N. Hervey, Worcester, December 29, 1853, Vol. V, p. 135; and May 31, 1855, Vol. V, p. 660.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, to E. P. Roberts, July 6, 1854, Vol. V, p. 361; and to E. N. Manley, July 11, 1854, Vol. V, p. 366.

²⁰ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Reverend E. Ryerson, New York (State?), August 20, 1857, Vol. VII, pp. 28-31.

²¹ *Ibid.*, August 7, 1857, Vol. VII, p. 14.

²² *Ibid.*, June 25, 1856, Vol. VI, p. 249.

Matters did not go auspiciously, however, and the firm soon found itself in a tangled controversy. A single example will indicate the root of the trouble. For the State of Maine, George P. Whittier was named agent. He was given sole control over the sale of the volume in the entire area and a discount of forty per cent. The Maine booksellers reacted promptly. Unable to get the volume at anything like a forty per cent discount, indeed unable to get the volume at all from Whittier, they threatened to purchase the book from Boston booksellers, lower the price, sell at a loss, and drive agent Whittier out of Maine. They argued that theirs were permanent businesses, and that there was no reason why, when a profitable book came along, they should be deprived of their profit by a sporadic agent. If they were to be relied on usually to sell books, let them be relied on always. The publisher knew a hornets' nest when it saw one. Nothing brings out more sharply the dependence of the publisher on the local distributor, or the place which the retail bookseller had come to occupy between 1840 and 1860, in the distribution of books, than this controversy. The publisher simply could not afford to alienate his best access to his market. Ticknor and Fields, accordingly, about-faced. The partners informed Whittier that his activities must be confined to those areas where the firm did not have accounts and that "we shall answer the orders of our regular correspondents in Bangor and Portland."²³ It is clear that after 1840 the book agent was no more the normal way to sell books than the system of obtaining subscriptions. Both had become obsolete at the same time and for the same reasons.²⁴

If, then, these were the methods of book distribution of a former day, what were the newer ones which supplanted them? There was essentially but one new method, though this one had

²³ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, July 10, 1856, Vol. VI, p. 267.

²⁴ It should not be assumed that selling either by subscription or through the agent was entirely abandoned by 1860. The subsequent history of the book trade denies this. But reputable, well-established publishers, in the chief centers of publishing, did not generally employ either method after 1860 except for books of a very special character or under very special circumstances.

an infinitude of procedures within it, namely, for the publisher to disassociate himself from the problems of retail selling and to rely upon others who were better fitted to do it for him.

The trend of the times made any other solution impracticable. The increase in population, whether spreading westward or concentrated in towns; the growth of literacy, with its insatiable demands for reading matter; the steamboat, the railway and the telegraph, which nationalized and integrated markets, made it no longer possible for the publisher to know in detail the many ramifications of each local market, while at the same time the increasing output of books constantly forced him to a closer attention to wholesale production. On the other hand, the bookseller, on the spot, was familiar from long association with the needs of his particular district, and, located in a strategically centered city, could reach the individual buyer far better than a distant publishing house. It is easy to see that it was more conducive to good distribution for the publisher to make his contacts with the retail bookseller, and leave to him the enigma of the retail market, than to endeavor to solve that question himself. While many elements of the industrial revolution made up the needs and provided the means for a changing technique in book distribution, the process was channeled through the retail bookseller, which the rising urban movement in American life had made effective.²⁵

More and more each year the distant markets were supplied through the booksellers of the growing cities. The list of "correspondents," as the firm called them, where Ticknor and Fields did business is like calling the roll of all the chief centers of population. Thus northern New England was supplied by booksellers in Bangor, Portland, Portsmouth and Keene; Massachusetts, outside the Boston periphery, in Worcester and Springfield; southern New England, in New Bedford, Hartford and New Haven. It was the same elsewhere. In New York State, the great volume

²⁵ Most of the publishers continued to sell books at retail in their own local markets, but even this tended to decline. Ticknor and Fields ceased all retail activity in 1864.

of Ticknor books flowed through the bookstores of Albany, Auburn, Rochester, and Buffalo; in the South, from Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Raleigh, Charleston, and New Orleans; in the West, first, through the river towns of the Ohio valley, Louisville, St. Louis, and especially Cincinnati; later, more directly westward, through Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago. Wherever there were cities, there were booksellers to distribute and readers to buy. Literate America and urban America were becoming identical.

Water routes and the steamboat were used for transportation wherever speed was not a factor. Frequently, in the 'fifties, combinations of steamboat and railway were advantageous, and by the close of that decade the exclusive use of the railway was not uncommon. The books of Ticknor and Fields for New York went by the Fall River Line, that is, by rail to Fall River and thence by Sound steamer; for Montreal, by steamer to Portland, then overland by rail; for Richmond, Charleston, and New Orleans, books were sent to New York where they were shipped by water; for Philadelphia, however, the steamers left direct from Boston, thence they could be dispatched to Baltimore or Washington. "We presume they will go as far as Phila. safely,—beyond that point we don't know much about," the partners declared to a Baltimore bookseller.²⁶ To the important west, the matter was more complicated because a choice of routes was available. Put briefly, if the destination was Cincinnati or the Ohio River cities, the books went first by steamer to Philadelphia, thence across Pennsylvania either by rail or by that State's curious canal system to Pittsburgh, then by steamer again down the Ohio. If the books went directly west, they were shipped across Massachusetts or to New York City, through the towns of New York State, after 1842 by rail to Buffalo, after which they reached Chicago either by Lake steamer or after 1853 by rail. It does not appear to the twentieth century

²⁶ *Letter Books, Domestic*, *op. cit.*, to J. S. Waters, Baltimore, October 11, 1853, Vol. V, p. 72.

to be either a simple or rapid system, but compared to anything which had preceded it, it was as swift as an eagle's flight.²⁷

How much all this cost is impossible to determine. Ticknor and Fields' correspondence deals at great length with freight charges but it never specifies the weight or the size. But a "parcel," whatever may have been its weight, took sixty hours to go by steamer to Philadelphia, cost \$1.50, and this was about one-half the rates by rail.²⁸

On the "correspondents" in these cities, Ticknor and Fields lavished the most careful blandishments, for it was on their good will that the firm would sell its publications in the wide markets beyond Boston. Special catalogues, circulars and "shew bills" for window decoration, free copies of books for editorial notice in the newspapers, local advertising, were all supplied them. But, when all was said and done, these booksellers were chiefly interested in how cheaply they could get the books. The question produced two developments which became the backbone of American book distribution in the mid-nineteenth century: the Trade Sale and the discount system.

The Trade Sales, held semi-annually in Philadelphia and New York, and once a year in Boston, were means of bringing the publishers and booksellers together. Their history is somewhat obscure, but the first to be held was through the influence of Carey and Lea in Philadelphia in 1824.²⁹ The first Trade Sale in Boston was 1827, and New York's was at about the same time.³⁰ The Boston Trade Sales enjoyed a brief favor for only about ten years, though they were revived with a considerable flourish of pub-

²⁷ The first recorded note of the use of the telegraph by Ticknor and Fields is April 11, 1851. *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 17. Considering how lavish are the expenditures of publishers today, a note of Ticknor and Fields to a Cleveland bookseller that "they did not telegraph and thus saved 75 cents," is startling. *Ibid.*, July 29, 1852, Vol. IV, p. 107.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, to J. S. Waters, Baltimore, October 21, 1851, Vol. III, p. 316.

²⁹ *American Publishers' Circular & Literary Gazette*, 8vo series, I, 131 (June 1, 1863).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, V, 294-295 (June 18, 1859); also *Boston Courier*, July 21, 1828.

licity in 1859. The Philadelphia Sales were undoubtedly the most important until the middle or late 'forties, but with the surpassing of that city by New York in the book trade, the New York Trade Sales took over leadership thereafter. The high-water mark of all the Trade Sales took place in September, 1855, in New York. There, through several days, a lavish Fruit Festival, so-called, was held at the Crystal Palace. Amid a bewildering display of exhibits, rounds of oratory and banquets, accompanied incidentally by a buying and selling of books, the trade outdid itself. Thereafter a decline in interest in Trade Sales is noticeable, and the Civil War dealt this method of book distribution a heavy blow.

In part the Trade Sales were a means of bringing together the publishers, as publishers. Agreements were entered upon,⁸¹ unbound sheets and stereotype plates were purchased and sold, and similar business transacted. Thus, Ticknor and Fields purchased at Bangs Brothers' spring sale in New York, in 1854, the plates of Bridge's *African Cruiser*, edited by Hawthorne, the *Mosses from an Old Manse*, and the *Fable for Critics*.⁸²

But primarily the purpose of the Trade Sale was to sell publishers' stock to retail booksellers. Samples to be sold were sent by the publishers, a catalogue of each firm's offerings was printed—over which there was a considerable jockeying for position,⁸³ for obviously no publisher wished his list offered on the fourth or fifth day of sale when a bookseller's wants were satiated, or his pocketbook empty—and the ensuing auction was placed in the hands of professional firms who managed the sale.⁸⁴ Through several days of high good humor, a considerable amount of intoxication, execrable puns by the auctioneers,⁸⁵ luncheons and din-

⁸¹ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Burgess & Stringer, New York, August 8, 1848, Vol. I, p. 94.

⁸² *Ibid.*, to Bangs Bros., New York, August 1, 1854, Vol. V, p. 371.

⁸³ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Cooley & Keese, New York, March 8, 1849, Vol. I, p. 357.

⁸⁴ The leading auction houses were: Leonard & Co., Boston; M. Thomas & Sons, Philadelphia; Cooley, Keese & Hill, Bangs Brothers, and G. A. Leavitt, New York.

⁸⁵ To a bidder of \$.25 for *The Battle of Waterloo*, the auctioneer declared that

ners, the stock was liquidated. The troubles began after the company had dispersed and it was discovered the auction houses had taken a larger commission than they were entitled to,³⁶ more books were sold than the publisher was prepared to supply, or orders were delayed in arriving,^{36a} and that the eager auctioneers had let volumes go for prices far less than the publisher had anticipated.³⁷

The advantages of the Trade Sale are apparent. It permitted the publisher to dispose of large amounts of stock in a shorter period than he might expect to do otherwise. Without indulging in an array of statistics, it may be noted that Ticknor and Fields sold in 1852, in the two New York Trade Sales of that year, 7,198 volumes; and in the Philadelphia Sales, 3,381, a total of 10,579.³⁸ In 1853, they sold 8,243 volumes in New York, and 6,613 in Philadelphia, a total of 14,856.³⁹

The Trade Sales also provided the publisher with large amounts of ready cash. After the amounts bought for their own retail store were deducted, Ticknor and Fields received from the 1853 Philadelphia spring Sales \$1038.78, and from the fall Sales, \$1143.73.⁴⁰ In the 1854 New York spring and fall Sales they received \$1554.48 and \$1156.46 respectively.⁴¹ It was es-

Wellington gave no quarter at that battle. J. C. Derby, *Fifty Years Among Authors, Books and Publishers* (New York, 1884), pp. 659-660, where are cited some others, even worse.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, to Bangs Bros., New York, May 3, 1851, Vol. III, pp. 47-48; May 6, 1851, Vol. III, pp. 51-52.

^{36a} *Ibid.*, to Cooley, Keese & Hall, New York, September 26, 1848, Vol. I, p. 154.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, to Bangs, Richards & Platt, New York, December 14, 1848, Vol. I, p. 248.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, to Bangs Bros., New York, March 29, 1852 *et ff.*, Vol. III, pp. 602-604, 614, 625; September 16, 1852 *et ff.*, Vol. IV, pp. 189-192, 203, 213, 219, 236, 256; and to M. Thomas & Sons, Philadelphia, March 19, 1852 *et ff.*, Vol. III, pp. 592-594, 606; September 6, 1852, Vol. IV, pp. 169-171.

³⁹ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Bangs Bros., New York, March 29, 1853, *et ff.*, Vol. IV, pp. 535-537, 540, 554, 572; September 14, 1853 *et ff.*, Vol. V, pp. 42-44, 47, 51, 55, 70, 78; to M. Thomas & Sons, Philadelphia, March 23 (?), 1853, Vol. IV, pp. 528-530; September 3, 1853, Vol. V, pp. 30-33.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, to M. Thomas & Sons, Philadelphia, April 18, 1853, Vol. IV, p. 575; September 13, 1853, Vol. V, p. 40; October 4, 1853, Vol. V, p. 67.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, to Bangs Bros., New York, April 20, 1854, Vol. V, p. 293; to Merchants Bank, Boston, December 8 (?), 1854, Vol. V, p. 504.

estimated in 1860, when the Trade Sales were beginning to decline, that the amount of all business transacted in the five Trade Sales of that year amounted to over \$700,000.⁴²

These advantages, however, were secured at too heavy a price. Often the publishers "remaindered" the fag-end of an edition which was not selling, or sandwiched into lots of good stock, old, stale and unsalable books. A worse effect resulted from the sale, sometimes in small amounts, sometimes in lump lots, of popular books, even new books, at greatly reduced prices. These "books with broken prices," as they were known, ruined thereafter the regular retail price. Booksellers, though they were supposed to maintain a uniform retail price, no matter for what they had bought the volume, nevertheless tended, if they had received the volume cheap, to sell at prices lower than the one set by the publisher. The result was obvious. It made for bad feeling with the consuming public, which naturally did not care to find the same book selling at different prices in different bookstores, and it made for bad feeling among the booksellers.⁴³ Thus, while the Trade Sale could have remained an effective method for distributing books, in the end it worked harm to the very object it sought to promote, and this was probably the chief cause of its decline.

The publisher was learning, in these same years 1840-1860, to deal directly with each individual retail bookselling house. This method may not have sold at any one time books in such quantity as the Trade Sale, but it was, at least judged by its permanency, a more successful development. The objective, of course, was still the same: to distribute books as widely as possible, with publisher and bookseller each extracting as much profit from the arrangement as possible. The result was a virtual battle over discounts, the issues of which were drawn by 1860, the conclusions, perhaps, not even settled today.

⁴² *American Publishers' Circular*, *op. cit.*, V, 329, 330 (July 9, 1859); 8vo series, I, 131 (June 1, 1863).

⁴³ *American Publishers' Circular*, *op. cit.*, 8vo series, II, 172 (January 1, 1864).

In the earliest stages the publisher sent out his stock to the bookseller on what he called "on sale," or "on commission." Books dispersed in this fashion could, at the end of six months or a year, be returned by the bookseller to the publisher if they remained unsold, usually at the bookseller's expense.⁴⁴ The discount allowed the bookseller was meagre, normally twenty-five per cent.⁴⁵

It appeared to be a workable arrangement. It enabled the publisher to distribute his books into a wide market and increased his sales; at the same time it protected the bookseller against unsalable volumes being dumped on his shelves and encouraged him to take many more books than he ever would otherwise have done, had he not felt he was guaranteed against loss.

On the other hand, there were manifest difficulties and it was not long before they appeared. The publisher sensed that when the bookseller was aware he could return volumes, sales were not so energetically pushed as would be the case if the bookseller knew he must bear the loss. "The object . . . is to induce you to take some risk & to feel interested in the sale of our publications," the firm wrote Evans & Brittan when that house returned too many books.⁴⁶

The principle is not a correct one in business . . . the discount does not warrant our guaranteeing the sale of every copy that you may purchase and an arrangement of this sort really amounts to this,

it wrote a few months later to T. B. Peterson.⁴⁷ Furthermore, books often came back damaged; or they came back after so long a period that either their sale value was gone, or new and revised editions had been issued, leaving the original edition no longer marketable. Booksellers were so—what shall we say?—unbusi-

⁴⁴ The *Letter Books* are filled with correspondence on the subject. E.g., to Bartlett & Welford, New York, July 21, 1848, Vol. I, p. 76; to H. Kernot, New York, January 18, 1849, Vol. I, p. 294; to W. H. Moore & Co., Cincinnati, February 10, 1849, Vol. I, p. 326.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, to W. J. Martein, Philadelphia, September 22, 1851, Vol. III, p. 257.

⁴⁶ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, January 23, 1854, Vol. V, pp. 164-165.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, September 16, 1854, Vol. V, p. 435.

nesslike that Ticknor and Fields even unpacked returned parcels to find the contents were not their own publications, or that only volume II had come back, without volume I.⁴⁸ But it was the uncertainty of knowing how many books to print, since it could not be known how many would be returned, that made the most trouble.

I wish we could accomodate [*sic*] you with our new editions, on sale, but . . . we find that it takes about a whole Edition to circulate first copies & we really do not know 'whereabouts' we are.⁴⁹

Considering the very great number of persons in the Trade you must see . . . that it wd. take quite an Edn. to supply a few cops. only to each house with the uncertainty of sales.⁵⁰

Ticknor and Fields, in line with all the leading publishers, made many efforts to rid themselves of these commission accounts. They withdrew entirely some of their most popular authors, beginning with Longfellow in 1849, and refused to send their works unless definitely ordered.⁵¹ They refused to open new commission accounts and sought to abrogate agreements already entered into.⁵² They even declared they had no such type of accounts.⁵³ But the truth is, that no matter what they said or tried to do, Ticknor and Fields never actually got out from under the system. They limited its scope; but the booksellers recognized its advantages, and destroy it the publishers could not.⁵⁴

There is a curious irony in one development. Until 1864 Tick-

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, to J. V. Cowling, Louisville, March 1, 1849, Vol. I, pp. 347-348; to S. Babcock, New Haven, March 24, 1849, Vol. I, p. 371; to R. C. Sargent, Lowell, July 9, 1851, Vol. III, p. 139; to Mason & Law, January 15, 1853, Vol. IV, p. 399.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, to North & Woodhouse, Richmond, November 4, 1851, Vol. III, p. 344.

⁵⁰ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to S. H. Barnes, New York (State), July 22, 1851, Vol. III, p. 172.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, to Bradley & Anthony, Cincinnati, May 5, 1849, Vol. I, p. 427.

⁵² *Ibid.*, to J. V. Cowling, Louisville, March 1, 1849, Vol. I, pp. 347-348.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, to Merriam, Moore & Co., Troy, April 26, 1854, Vol. V, p. 301; to T. H. Pease, New Haven, August 31, 1855, Vol. V, p. 719; to W. H. Jewett, Cleveland, January 30, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 577.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, to Hutchinson, Chaffee & Co., Springfield, July 8, 1854, Vol. V, p. 363; to E. P. Rudd, New York, December 28, 1854, Vol. V, p. 528.

nor and Fields were retail booksellers themselves, as well as publishers. As such, they found the system of commission accounts to their advantage. It is startling to read the letters which they wrote as booksellers, demanding the very terms from other publishers, which, as publishers, they were rejecting, when they wrote to booksellers.⁵⁵

Instead of sending any and all of their list of publications "on sale," Ticknor and Fields commenced in 1849 and 1850 to ship only what they termed "first lots" on sale; any books sent thereafter were on order. The number of titles so sent was determined by the size of the bookseller's establishment but the number was usually between four and twelve.⁵⁶ The bookseller viewed the change with restrained enthusiasm and often endeavored to circumvent it by sending back unsold copies whether he had received them "on sale" or "on order."⁵⁷ Yet the plan did offer the retailer a trial experience with a new book and he could legitimately feel when he later placed a definite order that he was not buying a pig in a poke.

We have followed the same policy with you as with others,

wrote the firm to Lamport, Blakeman & Law, New York, January 24, 1854,

the *First lots* are sent on sale; thereafter all sent are considered as purchased. This enables all parties to have new books at once & if not adapted to the market they can be returned.⁵⁸

In 1855, Ticknor and Fields commenced to hedge in still further the commission privilege. "First lots" were returnable only if they were exchanged for an order of other books.

We will make the same arrangements with your house, [Merrill & Metcalf, Lowell] that we have made with some others, viz. to send such numbers of our new

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, to J. S. Redfield, New York, February 3, 1852, Vol. III, p. 507.

⁵⁶ *Letter Books, Domestic, op. cit.*, to Phinney & Co., Buffalo, October 30, 1852, Vol. IV, p. 281; to Starr & Co., New London, December 1, 1858, Vol. VII, p. 683.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, to B. H. Norman, New Orleans, June 25, 1855, Vol. V, p. 669.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 171.

books as you may suggest, when published, & at the end of 6 mos. you may *Exchange* such as you have on hand in good condition, *free of expense to us*, for any others of our publications . . . This will not apply to such books as you may order but only to such as you may not find saleable from our new books.⁵⁹

The great weapon which the publisher had in forcing his viewpoint upon the bookseller was in the discount he granted, for by it he could appeal to the bookseller's profit motive and self-interest. It will be recalled that when the bookseller received his allotments "on sale" he got only a twenty-five per cent discount. If he did not sell the volume, he incurred no loss, it is true, because he could return the books; but if he did sell, and he was in business for that purpose, he made no great gain either. However, if he would give definite orders, the publisher was prepared to increase the discount rate, allowing it to mount as the size of the order increased.

Not that the publisher always saw it in that light. He groaned constantly that he could not afford the higher discounts and that the amount of profit left him was so meagre he would be forced out of business. Yet his determination to get rid of the unbusiness-like "commission sales," together with the increasing competition from other publishers bent on the same object, as well as the general rivalry developing in the 'fifties for markets resulting from mass production, sent the discount rates up notwithstanding.

There was no inexorable rule about the amount of discount allowed before 1860. The bookseller sought to push it as high as he could and the publisher to extend it as little as possible. Nevertheless the trend is clear. For books "ordered," in contrast to those sent "on sale," the discount rate rose first to thirty per cent, to which was added an inducement of five per cent more for cash payment. Then followed in the middle 'fifties offers of thirty-three and one-third per cent (the cash allowance still holding). If there was by 1860 such a thing as a normal rate of dis-

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, January 28, 1856, Vol. V, p. 896; also to T. H. Pease, New Haven, September 7, 1855, Vol. V, p. 730; to W. H. Jewett, Cleveland, January 30, 1857, Vol. VI, p. 577.

count, this was it. However, there were many special cases, and these not infrequently sent the discount rates still higher to thirty-seven and one-half and forty per cent, though in such cases it was usually offered only as an inducement for the bookseller to take large orders of not less than one or two hundred, and possibly even five hundred, books at one time. When the discount amounted to over forty per cent it was only for isolated instances, usually for "remaindered" volumes. It does not over-simplify the situation to say that this method, which came into its own between 1840 and 1860, was the one by which most books were distributed to the American people.

Thus the bookseller-publisher of 1830, his output small and his market strictly localized, ceased to exist. There emerged instead, under the stress of industrial and social change between 1840 and 1860, a publisher class whose functions were distinctly specialized and who now reached its markets through another specialized group, the urban retail bookseller. From the records of Ticknor and Fields, the one publishing house we have been able to examine, the development is clear how these two together distributed the books which writers created and the American public read.

An Addition to the Bibliography of Samuel Johnson*

By HERMAN W. LIEBERT

THE bibliography of Samuel Johnson has in recent years, through zealous Johnsonian scholarship, increased considerably. Some conception of its magnitude may be gained from the facts that Boswell's list of the prose writings of Johnson, appended to the *Life*, contains about a hundred items, that Courtney's bibliography of 1915 almost doubled that number, and that about thirty items have been added since then.

Some of these additions are books written by Johnson but not previously credited to him. More, however, are books to which he in some way contributed, furnishing a preface, a dedication, or general editorial advice.

Johnson was, throughout his literary life, almost always willing to revise the writings of his friends. As early as 1745 he "blotted a great many lines" in Madden's exhausting poem, *Boulter's Monument*, and as late as 1783 he revised the far better verses of Crabbe's *Village*. In the interval lie a number of similar tasks: the books of Mary Masters, John Gwynn, William Shaw, and many more profited by his assistance. Each of these volumes, "illuminated here and there with a ray of his own genius," has taken its rightful if subordinate place on the Johnsonian shelf.

To this list may now be added another book revised by Johnson, which his bibliographers have apparently not recorded. The volume is:

* Read at the Society's meeting in New York, June 13, 1947.

P O E M S

T O

HER MAJESTY:

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A NEW TRAGEDY,

ENTITLED, THE

EARL OF SOMERSET;

LITERALLY FOUNDED ON HISTORY:

WITH A

PREFATORY ADDRESS, &c.

By HENRY LUCAS, A.M.

STUDENT OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE,

AUTHOR OF THE TEARS OF ALNWICK, VISIT FROM THE SHADES, &c.

—*Tentanda via est, quæ me quoque possum*
Tellure humo—

VIRGIL

'Tis Nature's precept, to attempt to rise,
On virtuous pinions, soaring to the skies.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

By WILLIAM DAVIS, N^o. 25, LUDGATE-HILL.

Sold also by J. DODSLEY, Pall-Mall; J. RIDLEY, St. James's-Street; J. MURRAY, Fleet-Street; and by the AUTHOR, N^o. 1, Sparrow-Street, Leicester-Fields; near Paten-Street.

M,DCC,LXXIX.

Poems | to | Her Majesty: | to which is added | a new tragedy, | entitled the | Earl of Somerset; | literally founded on history: | with a | prefatory address, &c. | [rule] | by Henry Lucas, A.M. | student of the Middle Temple, | author of the Tears of Alnwick, Visit from the Shades, &c. | [rule] | [quotation from Virgil and translation] | [double rule] | London: | printed for the author, | by William Davis, No. 25, Ludgate-Hill. | Sold also by J. Dodsley, Pall-Mall; J. Ridley, St. James's-Street; J. Murray, Fleet- | Street; and by the author, No. 1, Spur-Street, Leicester-Fields; near Panton-Street. | [short rule] | M,DCC,LXXIX.

Quarto, 28.4 x 22.5 cm. (uncut). Published 9 December 1779 (*Public Advertiser*). Price 10/6, or one guinea bound.

Collation: Two unsigned and unnumbered leaves: half-title, verso blank, and title, verso blank; two unsigned leaves, pp. [i]-iv: dedication; sigs. B-D, pp. [1]-24: poems; sigs. E-Ee, pp. [i]-[xlvi] plus pp. [1]-146: title to the play, verso blank, prefatory address, prologue, persons of the play, and text of the play. Four unsigned leaves, pp. [i]-[viii], containing the list of subscribers, are variously placed. A copper plate engraved by William Sharp faces the title, and another, of a scene from the play, by Sharp after a design by Lucas, faces K3 verso, persons of the play.

This book is in a number of public collections, but, as is so often the case, is now seldom encountered elsewhere.¹ Johnson, Reynolds, Benjamin West, and John Wolcot are among the hundred subscribers.²

The dust which has very properly gathered on the life and works of Henry Lucas has seldom been disturbed. A few facts are therefore in order.

Lucas was born in Dublin about 1740. He was the son of Dr. Charles Lucas, physician, politician, and polemic writer, whose resistance to authority and popularity with the mob won him the title, "the Wilkes of Ireland." Henry matriculated at Trinity College, Dublin, the college of Burke and Goldsmith, which first transformed plain "Mr." Johnson to the more familiar "Dr." Lucas received the B.A. degree in 1759 and the M.A. degree in

¹ A cursory search has located six copies: British Museum (2), Harvard, Huntington, Newberry, Yale. A copy of the play alone, extracted from the volume, is in the Library of Congress.

² Johnson's copy of the book was part of lot no. 335 in the sale catalogue of his library.

1762. He then moved to London, and, still following in the steps of Burke, entered the Middle Temple, but spent the greater part of his time addressing obsequious verses of inferior quality to various susceptible royal and noble persons. At length he essayed a tragedy on the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury by creatures of the Earl of Somerset, a subject which Johnson's friend Richard Savage had already dramatized in 1723, with a revival (re-written) in 1777. But Lucas could not get his play produced; he complains in the lengthy prefatory address that the managers held the play four years without reaching a decision. It is hard to believe that they could have held it four days without knowing it for the wretched thing it is, though it may have suggested to them the production of the Savage drama. Finally, in 1779, Lucas published his play, with some poems to the Queen, at his own expense.

This is all very well, but what has the book to do with Johnson? The evidence of his part in it is unquestionable. In the prefatory address to the play (I 2 recto) Lucas mentions, "... Dr. Samuel Johnson—to whom permit me thus publicly to express my gratitude, for the peculiar kindness of his perusal, emendations, and good opinion of this work" The play, then, was revised by Johnson and belongs among his first editions.

But it is not necessary to take the statement of Lucas on faith. In Boswell's journal for Sunday, 11 April 1779, we have a further record, preserved with that care for minute incident which makes Boswell the first of biographers. Boswell joined Johnson this day at the rooms of John Hoole, the translator of Tasso.

The scene is one that deserves a little setting. Hoole was then probably living in Shire Lane, a narrow passage opening a few paces east of Temple Bar, which the *Quarterly Review* a little later described as "a vile, squalid place, noisy and noxious, nearly inaccessible to either light or air, swarming with a population of the most disreputable character." (The Eighteenth Century, we sometimes forget, was not all coaches and candle-light.)

The great world nevertheless often ventured into the neigh-

borhood. In Shire Lane Steele located his immortal Tatler's Club, and here met the more famous Kit-Kat Club, where birth and letters mixed and wine ran free. To Shire Lane Johnson, like other literary friends, came frequently to visit Hoole.

The company on this eleventh of April was bidden for dinner, and one may guess that Johnson, as he made his way up the lane, was hoping the meal would include one of the good puddings for which Mrs. Hoole had a reputation. With him were Boswell and the blind Mrs. Williams. Perhaps before dinner they walked in Hoole's garden, a plot often favored with Johnson's majestic perambulations. Later, Henderson the actor joined them. But this was not to be one of those immortal days on which Johnson rolled his thunder. On this occasion, Boswell tells us, "the Dr. [was] not fertile." One subject, however, they did discuss, on which Boswell's words may be quoted:

Johnson was not pleased with young Lucas for advertising his play as 'kindly revised and recommended to the state by that Standard of Literature, Dr. Samuel Johnson.' Yet he had revised it, and the play had his red ink markings on the margin, and Lucas had a letter too which he shewed. I askt, 'You did not strike out much?' JOHNSON. 'No, Sir.' BOSWELL. 'Then 'twas kindly revised.'³

One of the reasons the Lucas book has not been previously connected with Johnson is that this passage in Boswell's journal was not reproduced in the *Life*, and was consequently not known until its publication in 1932 by Colonel Isham, to whom all Eighteenth Century scholars owe an incalculable debt.

By "advertising his play" Boswell apparently does not refer to newspaper notices. There do not seem to be any advertisements of the book in the papers before 11 April, and the prefaces to the poems and play are dated 4 June and 1 July respectively, so that advertisement as early as April seems unlikely. The phrase to which Johnson objected sounds, however, like a direct quotation. It may have appeared in proposals or in an early draft of the preface to the play; Boswell may even be indicating merely the

³ *Private Papers of James Boswell*, F. A. Pottle, ed., n.p., 1932. XIII, 219.

substance of Lucas' oral attempts to get subscribers or to win stage presentation. When the book was finally advertised for sale on 9 December, Johnson's connection with it was stated, but not in quite the words Boswell quotes. According to the newspaper announcement, ". . . the Tragedy was favored with the revisal, amendments, and approbation of Dr. Johnson."⁴

The letter which Johnson wrote to Lucas does not seem to have survived; it is not in Chapman's painstaking check-list.⁵ And unless the manuscript of the play with Johnson's corrections is recovered, it is unlikely that his contributions can be identified. Internal evidence provides no clue.

From Boswell's record it might be supposed that Johnson in April 1779 had read the play recently. But, on 3 May 1777, he had written to Dr. Taylor:

Mr. Lucas has just been with me. He has compelled me to read his tragedy, which is but a poor performance, and yet may perhaps put money into his pocket; it contains nothing immoral or indecent, and therefore, we may very reasonably wish it success.⁶

In view of this, it would be tempting to identify Lucas with that dogged dramatist of whom Johnson said to Henderson the actor, "I never did the man an injury; but he would persist in reading his tragedy to me." The presence of Henderson at Hoole's on 11 April might even seem to confirm this. Indeed, Hill advanced this hypothesis in a note on Johnson's letter to Taylor, as did Thomas Secombe in his article on Lucas in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. But it was known from Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes* that the offending playwright was Joseph Reed.⁷ For that reason Hill later withdrew his nomination of Lucas for this unwelcome rôle.⁸

⁴ *Public Advertiser*, 9 December 1779, p. 1, col. 3.

⁵ *Review of English Studies*, XIII, 139-176 (April, 1937). Supplementary list, XVI, 66-68 (January, 1940).

⁶ *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, G. B. Hill, ed., Oxford, 1892, II, 9.

⁷ John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the 18th Century*, London, 1815, IX, 116.

⁸ *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, G. B. Hill, ed., Oxford, 1897, II, 411.

But, however bad Reed's play may have been, the play by Lucas can hardly have been better. After yards of windy moralizing in the blankest of blank verse, a climax at last is reached in Overbury's final speech, the dashes carefully indicating the gasps of the dying man:

Pray him—to think—of Overbury's sufferings—
And thinking—to repent—for, oh!—how transient—
Are human joys—and all this world is—Oh!

(Dies. The Scene closes.

Shortly afterward, the Countess of Somerset picturesquely inquires:

... Was it for this,
I tore me from a Husband's eager grasp!
That 'scaping Scylla, I might sink more deep
In fell Charybdis' gulph!—O Man! Man! Man!

And when finally, in a triumph of justice, the villain rings down the curtain by losing his reason, he does so just in time to spare the reader a similar fate.

The audience is mercifully saved, however, from one additional horror, for Lucas was apparently unaware that Somerset's agents, after having mixed at least four kinds of poison in Overbury's food and drink for more than four months, finally did in this indestructible fellow by a clyster, or enema, of corrosive sublimate. What such a poet could have done with such a fact staggers the imagination.

The book seems to have been received with extraordinary charity by the contemporary press. The *London Review* found "more beauties than defects,"⁹ but the *Monthly Review*, with a good deal more sagacity, resolved its surprise at Johnson's apparent sponsorship by supposing, quite correctly, that the author "has explained some good-natured expression of the critic's with a latitude of interpretation which he never intended it should bear."¹⁰ As Johnson himself observed, on another occasion,

⁹ *London Review*, XI, 143 (February, 1780).

¹⁰ *Monthly Review*, LXIII, 231 (September, 1780).

"There is a great difference between what is said without our being urged to it, and what is said from a kind of compulsion. If I praise a man's book without being asked my opinion of it, that is honest praise, to which one may trust. But if an author asks me if I like his book, and I give him something like praise, it must not be taken as my real opinion."

Chapman has justly observed, of the books for which Johnson wrote dedications, that, apart from Percy's *Reliques*, they are of little interest save as Johnsoniana. This is at least equally true of the books Johnson revised, Goldsmith's and Crabbe's excepted. Certainly Lucas' play, *The Earl of Somerset*, has not wit enough—nor any other virtue but its Johnsonian connection—to keep it sweet. But such is the force of Johnson's personality that, since the day of his death, there has been an unbroken succession of persons who, like the writer, have found it fascinating to add a single fact, however small, to the Johnsonian record. We remain, like Boswell, "firm and confident in the opinion that minute particulars are frequently characteristic and always amusing when they relate to a distinguished man."

Notes on the Original Library of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1693-1705

By JOHN MELVILLE JENNINGS

THE temptation to apply Thomas Carew's line "The phoenix builds her spicy nest" to the title of this paper was regretfully passed by. A regard for the reader's sensibilities prompted this decision, for the phoenix has grown tedious in papers concerning libraries risen from the charred remnants of their antecedents. A summary view of the history of the William and Mary College Library nevertheless brings the thought to mind. Indeed, the present Library is the fourth book collection accumulated for the College's use. The original collection was destroyed by fire on October 29, 1705, twelve years after the College was founded; the second collection flourished for a century and a half, but was totally consumed in flames that gutted the main College building on February 8, 1859; and the third collection was destroyed, in large measure, on September 9, 1862, during the occupation of Williamsburg by Federal forces. As the following notes stem from an inquiry into the nature and origins of the first, or original, collection, it is fairly obvious that Carew's quotation merited a certain amount of consideration before being rejected.

Research into the early history of the Library is unfortunately hampered by the fragmentary nature of the College archives. Until the translation of 1908, when the present Library building was first occupied, the official College records, as well as the Col-

lege Library, were housed in various sections of the main College building.¹ The three calamitous fires that swept through this building prior to their final removal, exacted a heavy toll in archival materials. Certain of the eighteenth-century records have been preserved; none, though, is early enough to facilitate a paper reconstruction of the book collection destroyed in the first fire.² The likelihood that any Library accession records ever did exist seems remote; gifts and donations would have been mentioned in either the Journals of the Faculty or of the Board of Governors, and book purchases would have been entered in the accounts rendered the College by its London agent. These have been destroyed. Although a catalogue of the Library was compiled prior to May 29, 1700, the only copy that might have survived—one sent to Dr. Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury—cannot be located. An equally serious disadvantage is manifested in the loss of President James Blair's personal papers and correspondence. The absence of such important sources of information is reflected in the title finally selected for this paper.

On December 3, 1691, shortly after arriving in London on his mission to secure the College Charter, the Reverend James Blair wrote back to Virginia outlining reasons why the early appointment of a president for the projected seat of learning appeared advisable. One of the reasons he advanced was "the overseeing of the . . . Library."³ This realization of its importance in Blair's mind (and it was Blair himself who became the first president) can be regarded as favorable indication of his activity on its behalf during his sojourn in England from 1691 to 1693. Many of the dignitaries whose patronage and friendship he secured—Dr. Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Gilbert Burnet, Bishop

¹ The only other translation of resources occurred in 1861, when many of the books were transferred to the President's House, thus preserving them from the fire of 1862.

² The earliest official College records extant—the Faculty Journals—commence on 16 August 1729.

³ James Blair to Francis Nicholson, 3 December 1691. *The Virginia Magazine of History* (hereafter abbreviated to *VMH*), VII, 160-163.

of Salisbury; Henry Compton, Bishop of London; Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester; Dr. Anthony Horneck—were distinguished men of letters. Therefore it does not appear likely that he failed to mention the desirability of including their printed works (as well as anything else they might see fit to give) in the College collection. And what more subtle way to ingratiate himself and the College project into these authors' esteem? Bishops Compton and Burnet proved agreeable and gave books to the Library; it cannot be determined exactly when, but certainly before 1699.

Blair's ingenuity has been overestimated if at this time he failed to secure from the first Earl of Burlington the printed remains of Robert Boyle. Boyle died in 1691, leaving a handsome sum to be devoted to pious and charitable uses. The income from this sum was allotted by Lord Burlington, executor of Boyle's will, to the support of the new seat of learning in Virginia. The Boyle family displayed on several subsequent occasions a friendly concern for the College. The third or "architect" Earl of Burlington in 1732 presented a portrait of his eminent relation, the great philosopher, that (having miraculously escaped the fires of 1859 and 1862) still hangs in the main building. Unfortunately for those who would trace his progress, Blair resorted mainly to personal interview, rather than to correspondence, in his efforts to gain support for the College project. This leaves sparse documentary evidence of his activity on its behalf, and complicates the problem of determining whether or not his efforts to solicit books, either from Lord Burlington or anyone else, met with success.⁴

The Royal Charter brought back to Virginia by President Blair

⁴ An examination of President Blair's detailed expense accounts for this mission (cf. [Francis Nicholson] *Papers Relating to an Affidavit* ([London] 1727), 68-72) fails to indicate that he returned to Virginia with any books in 1693. The London agent of the College, however, would have undertaken the arrangements for their transportation, as he performed similar services on subsequent occasions (cf. *The William and Mary College Quarterly* [hereafter abbreviated to *WMQ*], 2nd series, XIX, 352-353; James Blair to Archbishop Tenison, 29 May 1700).

in 1693 stated that the new institution was founded to the end that "the Church of Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the gospel, and that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners, and that the Christian faith may be propagated amongst the Western Indians." With these high aims in view, the establishment was constituted a "perpetual College of Divinity, philosophy, languages, and other good arts and sciences, consisting of one president, six masters or professors, and an hundred scholars more or less." Such a declaration of intent would supposedly have governed any plans formulated for the organized acquisition of library materials. But more likely than not, plans of this nature existed only in the mind of the Reverend Mr. Blair. And for several years to come his energies in Virginia were required by College matters other than the Library. It might be noted, however, that Blair, as well as his principal assistant, Headmaster Mungo Ingles of the Grammar School, held a master of arts degree from the University of Edinburgh. He was therefore acquainted with its Library, and to a lesser degree with the Library of Marischall College, Aberdeen, where he studied as an undergraduate. These recollections were probably reviewed when he set about forming a library for the academic fledgling in Virginia.

The main College building, the so-called "Sir Christopher Wren Building," was begun in 1694. It was first occupied in 1697 when the Grammar School attached to the College admitted a small group of "scholars." One room of this building, apparently on the second floor, was set aside for the Library. The room was presumably—for no definite information is available—furnished with wooden presses or cases, plus necessary tables and stools. Had Blair put into effect rules that governed his own university library at Edinburgh, books were never circulated and the Library served merely as a reading room.⁵ But any regulations

⁵ Sir Alexander Grant, *The Story of the University of Edinburgh* (London, 1884), II, 173.

drawn up to govern its administration and use have long since disappeared. In this connection, the later comments of Hugh Jones indicate that use of the Library was restricted to the College masters.⁶ This practice would have been in accord with contemporary regulations at other collegiate establishments.⁷

The observations of Hugh Jones also support the belief that one of the ushers was charged with custody of the Library—this, “in order to make his Place more agreeable to his merit.”⁸ The College was without an usher until 1699, so Blair himself, or else Mungo Ingles, served as Librarian until an usher arrived.⁹ Misfortune attended the first efforts to fill this post, which brought forth loud lamentations from the overworked Ingles. He later made a terse notation that the first candidate “Dyed at Cowes & he that was to succeed him Married a Wife . . . & could not come.”¹⁰ William Robertson, who became Clerk of the College at the turn of the century, signed a receipt on at least one occasion for books presented to the collection.¹¹ And this might indicate that his predecessor in the clerkship, Francis Clements, rather than Blair or Ingles, served as Library Keeper until an usher was secured in the person of John Hodges. In fact, if Blair assigned this particular duty to Clements, he could well have pointed out a precedent at Edinburgh, where the Secretary of the College was charged with the offices of librarian.¹² John Hodges, Usher and

⁶ Hugh Jones, *The Present State of Virginia* (London, 1724), 86.

⁷ Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1935), 270.

⁸ Hugh Jones, *op. cit.*, 91.

⁹ Although the College accounts for 1697 (cf. *WMQ*, 1st ser., VIII, 169) indicate a disbursement of £25 to “Mr Mullikin usher,” it seems likely that he never served in that capacity. His name does not appear again in the College records now available, and, as £25 was the amount allowed ushers for their transportation to Virginia (cf. *WMQ*, 1st ser., VII, 259), it is probable that he was one of the ill-fated gentlemen referred to by Mungo Ingles as either dead or married.

¹⁰ Mungo Ingles, “A Modest Reply to Mr. Commissary Blair’s Answer to My Reasons for Quitting the College,” 15 February 1705. *VMH*, IX, 153.

¹¹ [Francis Nicholson] *Papers Relating to an Affidavit* (London, 1727), 35.

¹² Sir Alexander Grant, *op. cit.*, II, 173.

presumably Library Keeper, remained in office only one year, being succeeded in 1700 by Orlando Jones, a former student at the College. Jones' tenure extended through 1702, when he was followed by a classmate, John Allen. Allen held the post until "The Colledge" was burned in 1705. The duties of Library Keeper could not have been arduous, and it is to be hoped were performed under less harrowing regulations than those imposed at Harvard College in 1667, which required that "upon the new choice or removall of the library keeper, the fellows shall look over the library and see that all the books be actually in their places; if any be wanting the library keeper shall make them good."¹³

The name of Colonel Francis Nicholson—"the great Maecenas of the College"—heads the list of known benefactors of the original Library. A catalogue of his books, endorsed by him on May 30, 1695, and now preserved at Fulham Palace, is prefaced with the statement that he desired to leave the entire collection upon his death to the College of William and Mary in Virginia.¹⁴ His generosity preceded this bibliographical effort, for he specifically noted that seven volumes from the collection had already been turned over to the College: Robert South's *Animadversion Upon Dr. Sherlock's Book Entituled a Vindication of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity* (1693); Gilbert Burnet's *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (1692), *The Life of William Bedell* (1685), *The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale* (1681), and his translation of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1684); an anonymous work, *The Art of Catechising: or, The Compleat Catechist* (1691), and John Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693). No earlier evidence than this donation, made prior to May 30, 1695, exists to show that a library was actually in the process of formation. The entire Nicholson collection was shortly afterwards turned over to the

¹³ Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936), I, 287.

¹⁴ The catalogue has been transcribed and printed in Sadler Phillips' *The Early English Colonies* (London, 1908), 39-44.

College,¹⁵ no doubt upon the donor's return to Virginia to assume the reins of government in 1698. This gesture may have led the House of Burgesses to affirm stoutly the following year that after the King, Colonel Nicholson was "the most zealous patron of the New Seat of Learning."¹⁶ Colonel Nicholson retained in his possession a copy of the catalogue, which was receipted by William Robertson, the College Clerk.¹⁷ A final vindication of the eccentric personal behavior that marked his second term of office in Virginia, 1698-1705, published in 1727, contained the somewhat rueful estimate that the books presented to the College cost a good fifty or sixty pounds sterling.¹⁸

The Nicholson catalogue represents a collection of well over two hundred volumes. Of this number, one hundred and fifty-eight works are mentioned specifically by title. The titles are arranged in the catalogue under three headings, according to the size of the volume: the folios and quartos each being listed separately, and the octavos and duodecimos entered together as a single group. The valuation is indicated in most cases, thereby affording a basis for verification of the estimate made by Colonel Nicholson in 1727. Identification of the entries is often complicated by a free rendition of the title, or else by complete absence of the author's name. One entry under the quartos covers "Thirty-nine books and pamphlets relating to the several sorts of trade and commerce." But this is the only entry comparable to the favorite colonial cataloguing term, "a parcel of old books." Even here the cataloguer was thoughtful enough to indicate the subject nature of the volumes so lightly dismissed. A large percentage of the works were printed after 1690. And this leads to the belief that Colonel Nicholson formed his collection between 1692 and

¹⁵ [Francis Nicholson] *op. cit.*, 35.

¹⁶ *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1695 . . . 1702* (Richmond, 1913), 166-167.

¹⁷ [Francis Nicolson] *op. cit.*, 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* The total of the prices in the Sadler Phillips transcript, printed in the Appendix, is £49 2s. 1d.

1694, while in England awaiting a new colonial appointment. The donation unquestionably provided a nucleus or core around which the new Library could be developed, and possibly served the altogether useful purpose of encouraging other benefactors to follow the Governor's high-minded example.

The Nicholson collection was predominantly religious in tone. The orthodox Anglican nature of this material fails to substantiate the implications involved in an assertion that Nicholson once kneeled during Mass said in the tent of James the Second on Hounslow Heath. The Biblical commentaries, catechistical works, and studies touching theology and ecclesiastical history would have proved valuable at the College had they survived the fire of 1705, and been available when formal instruction touching those subjects was later undertaken. The donation contained several sizable groups of books treating subjects not generally identified with the College course of study. In this category were a large number of works on trade and commerce (which indicate, however, that Colonel Nicholson was thoroughly aware of Whitehall's trust in its colonial appointees), gardening, and husbandry. Aside from the formidable array of Anglican literature and learning, the collection failed to offer any considerable sustenance in the form of scholarly attainment. Although he was unquestionably an enthusiastic supporter of educational ventures, Nicholson could hardly be termed a great scholar himself. His books betrayed little feeling for those intellectual pursuits with which contemporary college curricula were concerned. Nor is this surprising, for one can reasonably suppose that the Nicholson library was formed under the stimulus of what Mr. Louis B. Wright terms "the purposeful reading of our colonial ancestors." It is useless to dwell on the negative aspects of the presentation. Instead, the reader is referred to the catalogue itself, reprinted as an appendix to these notes, for a complete listing of the resources. The deficiencies and adequacies then become readily apparent.

The first known expenditure of College funds on the original Library was made in 1697. The College building accounts, forwarded by Governor Sir Edmond Andros to England and there preserved in the Public Records Office, carry an entry under February 27, 1697, disbursing £32 11s. 10d. for "books Mapps & papers as per Accot."¹⁹ Further details regarding this acquisition have been lost. The same accounts carry one other pertinent entry covering the purchase of "Bloomes History of the Bible," i.e., Nicolas Fontaine's *The History of the Old Testament* (1690) and *The History of the New Testament* (1688), issued by the inveterate publisher, Richard Blome.²⁰ The funds for this purchase, in the amount of £1 10s., were received from the friendly London merchant, Sir Jeffrey Jeffreys.²¹ The second major expenditure—to be sure, the only other major expenditure definitely identified with the original Library—grew out of funds derived from "Dr. Bray's Associates." A donation of £50 was received prior to 1700.²² No record remains to indicate what accessions were secured with this sum, which, as a matter of fact, might have swelled to greater proportions had not an element of coolness developed between Bray and President Blair. Other College funds may have been spent on the Library; this, though, cannot be verified in the documentary evidence that now remains.

Donations to the Library from English friends of the College were reaching Williamsburg before the century ended. That gratifying fact was noted in May Day speech in 1699 by one of the "scholars," whose eloquence bore the imprint of President

¹⁹ *WMQ*, 1st Ser., VIII, 169.

²⁰ Richard Blome, "a notorious plagiarist" according to John Nichols, was much engaged in the practice of publishing books by subscription (cf. John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* [London, 1812], VI, 8); this may have provoked Sir William Dugdale to declare "he gets a livelihood by bold practices" (cf. "Richard Blome," in *DNB*). The so-called "Blome's Bible" was from the pen of Nicolas Fontaine, writing under the pseudonym "Sieur de Royeaumont" (cf. *N & Q*, 2d ser., VI, 310).

²¹ *WMQ*, 1st ser., VIII, 169.

²² Library of Congress Mss.: Papers of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Dr. Bray's accounts . . . Anno 1695 . . . Anno 1699.

Blair's adroit coaching: "... and here I must not omitt the generosity of the two famous Bishops of London & Sarum, who has broke the Ice to the other Bishops, in makeing a noble present of well chosen bookes to our Library, intending hereby to take care that our Youth be well seasoned with the best principles of Religion and Learning that can be taught by the most sound & Orthodox Divines . . ." ²³ The ice was broke indeed, but the exact nature of these donations made by Bishops Compton and Burnet is left to the conjecture of the curious. Several years after the Library was destroyed, Mungo Ingles asserted the holdings were mainly the gift of his Grace of London. But this officious statement must be discounted, as it is contained in a petition which that canny Scot addressed to Bishop Compton begging books on his own behalf. ²⁴ The natural patron of the College and of the Library was the Bishop of London, it lay in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he alternated, as a general rule, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as College Chancellor, and normally the College President served as his Commissary or personal representative in Virginia. Bishop Compton was seemingly aware of this responsibility—and so were the College authorities.

The same "scholar" who praised Bishops Compton and Burnet's gifts of books in a May Day, 1699, speech, optimistically added: "... and this example will be quickly followed by the present Lord Primate of England, a worthy successor to Dr. Tillotson, who continues to water this Nursery wch his predecissor took such care to plant." ²⁵ Dr. Tenison, the Archbishop, was not moved by this avowal of confidence to emulate his two spiritual colleagues. And had not President Blair taken prompt steps to remedy the situation, the "Nursery" might have withered and

²³ Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. Research Dept. Mss.: Francis Nicholson papers. 4th scholar's speech. Also printed in *WMQ*, 2nd ser., X, 333-335.

²⁴ Mungo Ingles to Bishop Compton, 20 September 1707. *WMQ*, 2nd ser., X, 73-74.

²⁵ Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. Research Dept. Mss.: Francis Nicholson papers. 4th scholar's speech.

died while awaiting nourishment from Lambeth. Blair pointedly reminded his Grace of his dereliction on February 12, 1700, declaring: "... I must continue to beg, that if it lies in your Grace's way you will encourage our New City of Williamsburg, and help our College Library."²⁶ This plea was shortly joined by a more suggestive supplication, dated May 29, 1700, in which his Grace was advised: "... I must upon this occasion beg leave to put your Grace in mind of your good intentions to help our Library to some good books. We are of opinion that if application were made to the severall good authors in England, they would enrich it at least with a present of their own books. And the Governours of our College have desired me to signify this much to your Grace that if you will employ any young Scholar that You think fit to ask books for us, we will allow him 20 pound a year for his pains. I have enclosed a Catalogue of what Books we have at present that Your Grace may the better judge what we want. If any books are procured, let them be sent to the house of Mr. Micaiah Perry a Virginia merchant in Leaden hall Street over against the end of Billiter Lane, who will take care to send them to us, and will likewise pay the charges of packing &c., and the said 20 pound, as your Grace shall direct."²⁷ How far these enterprising efforts were rewarded cannot be stated with any degree of certainty. The Archbishop, in any event, advised Governor Nicholson on November 10, 1701, that "I have some books for Yor Library but have not sent them yet . . . Nevertheless what is delayed is not designed not to be perform'd."²⁸ The catalogue mentioned in Blair's letter of May 29 has unfortunately been destroyed or misplaced.

The indefatigable antiquarian and Bodleian Library Keeper,

²⁶ James Blair to [Archbishop Tenison] 12 February 1700. William Stevens Perry, *Historical Collections* ([Hartford] 1870), I, 112-113.

²⁷ James Blair to [Archbishop Tenison] 29 May 1700. *WMQ*, 2nd ser., XIX, 352-353.

²⁸ Archbishop Tenison to Francis Nicholson, 10 November 1701. *VMH*, XXII, 248.

Thomas Hearne, recorded in his diary shortly after the Library was burned that "... Letters from Virginia say that the College at Williamsburg, a most Stately Fabrik & one of the best in all America, & to wch the late King Wm had been a Benefactor, was on the 29th of October last [i.e., 1705] utterly consum'd by fire wch by an unknown accident broke out in the very dead of the Night together with the Library, to wch divers persons bearing any Love to Learning had been Contributors, & in all probability would in some time have grown very famous."²⁹ This observation came from a professional librarian, familiar with the intricacies of his calling, and well acquainted among the English *literati* of his day. His comments on the "divers persons" who contributed to the Library possibly indicate a knowledge of the efforts to solicit books from "the severall good authors" in England.

Among the probable benefactors is the philosopher John Locke. On October 16, 1699, he wrote to President Blair stating: "... You that know my bad health, some part of my business in town, will I doubt not pardon the slowness of my return to your letter of February last, especially since it contained no thing of business to be done but gratefull reflections on what had been done with an overgreat opinion expressed of that service which you imagine you had from my hand in the doing of it . . . I hope the College grows & flourishes under your care. I would be glad to know whether you carried over with you a Baroscope & Thermoscope from hence when you went over last"³⁰ Although definite proof that he presented books to the Library is not to be had, the cordial tone of his letter to the Founder implies a keen interest in the College's well-being. It is reasonable to suppose that this distinguished solicitude embraced the Library.

The Dowager Duchess of Beaufort advised Governor Nichol-

²⁹ Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections* (Oxford, 1885-1921), I, 186.

³⁰ John Locke to James Blair, 16 October 1699. William Stevens Perry, *op. cit.*, I, 66-67.

son in 1701 that she and some of her friends were "disposed to contribute a Sum of money of about 100 or 150 lbs towards the promoting of piety" in Virginia.³¹ She authorized the Governor to invest the fruits of this evangelical zeal either in "Bookes or in other Charity." If the former, her Grace expressed the wise opinion that "they may best be had . . . in England, and in that case . . . please to send a List of such as may be thought most proper" Colonel Nicholson's enthusiasm for the College, which was yet to be tried by President Blair's high-handed behavior,³² possibly led him to divert these funds to the Library's advantage. On the other hand, the good intentions of her Grace may have proceeded no further than those of her great-great-grandson, the fifth Duke, who corresponded long and mightily on the subject of a memorial to be placed in the College Chapel in memory of his uncle, Lord Botetourt; it was never erected.³³

Such diligence in the solicitation of contributions for the Library in England is no indication that Virginia fields were left untilled. Certain of the more active colonial promoters of the College project possessed personal libraries of considerable size and distinction. Three of the six private libraries analyzed by Mr. Wright in his *The First Gentlemen of Virginia* (1940) were owned by members of the College Board of Governors: Ralph Wormeley, Robert Carter and William Byrd. In the canvass for donations, these gentlemen were likely prospects. The Philip Ludwells, the elder not only a Trustee of the College, but brother-in-law of President Blair as well, and the younger soon to become a member of the College Board of Governors, may have donated some of the books from the library at Greenspring, the Ludwell

³¹ H. Crow [on behalf of Mary, Dowager Duchess of Beaufort] to Francis Nicholson, 7 September 1701. *VMH*, XXII, 248-249.

³² President Blair was not a man to be treated lightly; thus when Nicholson foolishly offended certain gentlemen of the Colony, including Blair, during his second administration, the foundations were laid for a celebrated controversy that shook Virginia to its core between 1702 and 1705.

³³ This correspondence is printed in *Tyler's Quarterly*, III, 106-126.

family seat situated some seven miles outside Williamsburg. It is pleasant to speculate on the titles that might have been secured from this source, for the Greenspring library was begun by the staunch old Royalist, Sir William Berkeley, a man of considerable literary pretensions and himself the author of several dramatic pieces (including *The Lost Lady; A Tragycoriedy* [1638], which was later reprinted in Dodsley's collection of old plays). Visitors passing through Virginia were also contacted in the campaign to secure donations. The only volume from the original collection now in possession of the College—a copy of Paolo Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* (1676)—was acquired through some such means. The extraordinary survival of this volume requires a few lines of explanation, even though the account entails a slight digression from the present narrative.

In December, 1942, the College Librarian, Dr. E. G. Swem, was astonished to receive word from war-ravaged England that a volume had been discovered at Bristol bearing an early inscription to the College of William and Mary. A book salvage drive had just been concluded at Bristol, during the course of which 763,857 volumes were collected. In scrutinizing this accumulation, the Bristol City Librarian, Mr. James Ross, came across the William and Mary volume. He wrote to inquire if the College wished to have it returned. The fly-leaf inscription, he added, indicated that the volume was "The Gift of Captain Nicholas Humfrys, Commander of the Ship Hartwell to Wm & Mary College, Anno 1703/4." Dr. Swem immediately posted an affirmative reply. Ensuing correspondence led to postponement of the volume's return until shipping conditions might become more certain. Mr. Ross in the meanwhile placed the volume in a bomb-proof shelter. When hostilities were terminated three years later, it was packed and forwarded to America. It reached Williamsburg safely in the Spring of 1946 and was replaced on the Library shelves after an absence of nearly 250 years.

The possibility that Captain Humfrys' gift was never de-

livered to the College was suggested as an explanation for its survival! This, of course, would have robbed the volume of much association interest, and, superficially, would have cast harsh reflections on a long series of conscientious laborers in the Library vineyard. Its provenance was therefore subjected to the closest scrutiny. The date of the fly-leaf inscription—"Anno 1703/4"—indicated that Captain Humfrys presented his gift between January 1 and March 24, 1704. The donor's failure to appear in Virginian waters during that period (Captain Humfrys, it might be noted, made at least four trips to Virginia during the period 1698-1706) would have strengthened the disagreeable likelihood that his gift never reached the College. Indeed, it would then have become probable that the book never left England. Such was not the case.

In a letter directed to the Reverend Isaac Grace on February 24, 1704, Philip Ludwell II, writing from Yorktown, stated that the vestry of Bruton Parish desired to consider Mr. Grace for the living then vacant in that parish. He added that he doubted "not you will maintain the character Captain Humphreys hath given me of you . . ."³⁴ The Reverend Mr. Grace had secured the King's Bounty on August 5, 1703, and apparently proceeded to Virginia on board Captain Humfrys' ship, the *Hartwell*. A heated controversy was then in progress between Governor Nicholson and the Bruton Parish Vestry concerning the question of induction. The Reverend Mr. Grace, an artless newcomer and anxious to secure the governor's goodwill, promptly endorsed Ludwell's letter and delivered it into the hands of Nicholson. In the violent altercation that followed its disclosure, the name of Isaac Grace practically disappears from contemporary records. His brief emergence nevertheless affords the clues necessary to establish two facts regarding the person of Captain Humfrys. First, the Captain was in Virginia, anchored off Yorktown, on a date that coincides with the date of his donation to the College. And

³⁴ Philip Ludwell to Isaac Grace, 24 February 1704. W. A. R. Goodwin, *The Record of Bruton Parish Church* (Richmond, 1941), 23.

secondly, he was on terms of familiarity with Philip Ludwell, one of the most devoted friends the College possessed.

It is within the realms of possibility that Ludwell himself brought this copy of *Sarpi* over to the College from Yorktown, together with the Captain's compliments. Just how long it remained in the Library before being removed is difficult to say. It was certainly out of the building by midnight, October 29, 1705. Exactly how and when it got back to England is equally subject to speculation. The title-page bears the eighteenth-century book-stamp of Homerton College, a Congregationalist seat of learning formerly situated in the London borough of Hackney. The volume carries no additional marks of its long absence from the William and Mary Library. To be sure, its final appearance in Bristol is as mystifying as its escape from destruction in 1705. One fact, however, is inescapable: the volume would have been irretrievably lost in 1942 but for the keen perception of Librarian James Ross.

All the high hopes and good intentions embodied in the original Library were dashed to the ground on the aforementioned night of October 29, 1705. The entire collection, the second college library founded in British America, was destroyed. Because of the lack of evidence, the nature of these resources, roughly estimated at around seven or eight hundred volumes, cannot be adequately treated. It would be unwarranted to assume that the characteristics of the Nicholson donation held true for the remainder of the Library. This would overlook the Compton and Burnet gifts of "well chosen bookes"; the Tenison and Dr. Bray's Associates benefactions, and the books actually secured through the expenditure of College funds (not to mention the donations and benefactions for which records no longer exist). It is hardly to be expected that the collection compared any too favorably with its older, and by then well-established, seventeenth-century American contemporary, the Harvard College Library. This de-

spite Professor Morison's admission that the latter was "lots of theology and a little of everything else."³⁵

The College of William and Mary remained hardly more than a grammar school for nearly two decades following its establishment: academic demands on the Library would have reflected this situation. That is, the need for book resources was not acutely felt until some years after the first Library was destroyed. The most potent incentive to rapid growth and development was therefore lacking. Little, to be sure, could have been accomplished in the short span of ten years—a period in sharp contrast to the century and a half of growth enjoyed by the second collection. Mr. Wright, commenting on the early benefactions of the Reverend Thomas Bray, observes that "the library of the college of William and Mary remained undistinguished, and Virginia continued to depend upon its private collections for intellectual sustenance."³⁶ This might be qualified by the statement that the resources of the original collection remain virtually an unknown quantity. It is difficult to state with certainty, no matter what the criteria, whether they were distinguished or undistinguished. It might be added that the second Library, 1705-1859, a vastly more significant collection insofar as the intellectual history of the College (surely a factor in the intellectual history of Virginia?) is concerned, has never been subjected to the close scrutiny of investigation. The problems which face the researcher there are as complicated as those outlined in the opening paragraphs of the present notes.

The news of the burning was conveyed to the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations by Governor Nott, successor to Colonel Nicholson, in a letter dated December 24, 1705: "... I am sorry that I must give ... the melancholy news of the burning of William & Mary College on the 29th of October between 11 and 12

³⁵ Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936), I, 295.

³⁶ Louis B. Wright, *The First Gentlemen of Virginia* (San Marino, California, 1940), 126.

oclock at night, a fire broke out there, wch was got to that height before it was discovered, that it was impossible to save it, the building, Library, and furniture was in a small time totally consumed”³⁷ It does not appear likely that any of the books were saved. The fire, as has been noted, was discovered late in the evening, and spread rapidly. The occupants of the building were hard pressed in many cases to save even themselves, and several of the students (including an inevitable scion of the Randolph family) were “esteemed utterly lost by their friends and relations who much bewailed ’em till they perceived their Happy escape and deliverance.”³⁸ All the evidence implies that none of the books or furnishings escaped. If anything was salvaged, subsequent fires in 1859 and in 1862 obliterated the traces that remained in possession of the College. The opportunity for pillage was doubtlessly favorable. Therefore it might be supposed that the sharp eye of some informal book collector would have alighted on a desirable item. The only volume from the original Library that has turned up to support this interesting possibility, however, is the aforementioned copy of Sarpi’s *History of the Council of Trent*.

The loss of books and papers in the disaster was not confined to the contents of the Library. Benjamin Harrison, Jr., who was residing in the building at the time—or according to the ever-acid Mungo Ingles, “for his greater Grandeur must needs keep his Court in the College”—lost all the materials he had collected for his projected history of Virginia.³⁹ Poor Ingles himself suffered the loss of his entire “study full of books,” which, he declared, cost him “many a deep sigh.” These sighs were artfully wafted to Bishop Compton in a letter dated September 20, 1707, the

³⁷ Library of Congress Mss: Transcript P. R. O., C. O. 5/1315, Edward Nott to Board of Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, 24 December 1705.

³⁸ Mungo Ingles to Bishop Compton, 20 September 1707. *WMQ*, 2nd ser., X, 73-74.

³⁹ *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (Richmond, 1925-1946), III, 149.

schoolmaster claiming: "I can not enough lament the loss of my books, 18 boxes or shelves crambed as full as could hold, 'tis very much contrary to my Nature to turn beggar, yet would willingly be obliged to his Grace my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and any of your friends for a small but choice collection of books of Divinity."⁴⁰ One intrepid individual, a Mr. Reedwood, attempted to save a "Genll. Map of the World," presented by Colonel Nicholson, that hung in the Grammar School Room, but "durst not for the flame that came pouring in from the south end."⁴¹ This same individual, all set to cover himself with glory, then dashed "out of the School, and saved the Douk of Milan that hung next to the dore that opens into the Piazza."⁴²

Despite contemporary rumors to the contrary, there seems little reason to believe the fire was other than accidental. Several previous fires, all extinguished in time to avert disaster, could definitely be attributed to faulty construction. On this occasion a spark from one of the chimneys found agreeable lodging on the shingles of the wooden roof, and from there spread over the entire building. "When I first heard of its being burnt," Mungo Ingles fatuously remarked, "I had so much charity for all mankind, that I was of the opinion that none under a Fury let loose from Hell could be capable of so much Mischief for Mischiefs sake." The more realistic Virginia Assembly instituted proceedings to inquire into the calamity, thereby provoking much lively testimony, but few definite conclusions. Several responsible witnesses testified that the fire broke out in the south end of the building, and went on to contend that it originated in President Blair's chamber chimney. Others argued that the conflagration was the work of three men, ominously "cloathed like Gentlemen," who were seen to run across New Kent road

⁴⁰ Mungo Ingles to Bishop Compton, 20 September 1707. *WMQ*, 2nd ser., X, 73-74.

⁴¹ Library of Congress Mss: Transcript Fulham Mss. Virginia. Box III, No. 41. "Deposition of Mungo Ingles, 20 September 1707."

⁴² *Ibid.*

from the College shortly after the fire was discovered. In referring to this possibility, Mungo Ingles offered up the pious hope that "if there be such devils out of Hell, God Almighty will bring their work of darkness to light." His plea miscarried. Indeed, the question of responsibility was debated until long after reconstruction was effected.

THE NICHOLSON CATALOGUE

All entries and notes actually appearing in the Sadler Phillips transcript of the Nicholson catalogue are here printed in italics. The original listing of the entries has not been subjected to rearrangement. Bracketed notations are used to indicate what is assumed to be the proper title and probable edition of the corresponding entry. It will be noted that five titles remain unidentified; these, however, may clear up when the final volumes of *STC* 1641-1700 become available.

A CATALOGUE OF MY BOOKS (TAKEN MAY 30TH, 1695) WHICH I DESIRE TO LEAVE
AFTER MY DEATH TO THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
IN VIRGINIA (COLONEL NICHOLSON).

<i>Books in folio:</i>	£.	s.	d.
<i>Archbishop Cranmer's "Memorials"—</i>	1	0	0
[Strype, John. <i>Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer</i> (London, 1693) fol.]			
<i>Wesley's "Life of Christ"—</i>	0	16	0
[Wesley, Samuel. <i>The Life of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: An heroic poem</i> (London, 1694) fol.]			
<i>"London Ministers' Cases to Recover Dissenters"—</i>	0	16	0
[?]			
<i>Baron Atkinson's "Speech to the Lord Mayor"—</i>	0	0	6
[Atkyns, Sir Robert. <i>The Lord Chief Baron Atkyn's Speech to Sir William Ashhurst</i> (London, 1693) fol.]			
<i>"Lex Mercatoria"—</i>	1	0	0
[Malynes, Gerard de. <i>Lex Mercatoria</i> (London, 1686) fol.]			
<i>Dr. Cave's "Lives of the Apostles and Fathers" (3 parts in 2 vols.)—</i>	2	4	0
[Cave, William. <i>Antiquitates Apostolicæ</i> (London, 1676) fol.]			
<i>"Roberts: his Map of Commerce"—</i>	0	11	0
[Roberts, Lewis. <i>The Merchant's Map of Commerce</i> (London, 1671) fol.]			
<i>"Cabala; or, Letters of State"—</i>	0	15	0
[<i>Cabala, sive Scrinia Sacra: Mysteries of State</i> (London, 1663) fol.]			
<i>Knox's "History of the Island of Ceylon in the East Indies"—</i>	0	8	0
[Knox, Robert. <i>An Historical Relation of the Island of Ceylon</i> (London, 1681) fol.]			
<i>Dr. Comber's "Works on the Common Prayer"—</i>	0	18	0
[Comber, Thomas. <i>A Companion to the Temple and Closet</i> (London, 1684) fol.]			

Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity"—	0	16	0
[Hooker, Richard. <i>The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity</i> (London, 1676) fol.]			
Sir Walter Raleigh's "History of the World"—	1	2	0
[Raleigh, Sir Walter. <i>History of the World</i> (London, 1687) fol.]			
Towterson's "Works," in 2 vols.—	1	14	0
[Towerson, Gabriel. <i>Explication of the Decalogue</i> (London, 1680) fol. (and) <i>Explication of the Lord's Prayer</i> (London, 1680) fol.]			
Dr. Hammond's "Works," in 4 vols.—	4	0	0
[Hammond, Henry. <i>Works Collected by his Amanuensis, Mr. William Fulman</i> (London, 1674-1684) fol.]			
"Mr. Mede: his Works"—	1	5	0
[Mede, Joseph. <i>Works</i> (London, 1672) fol.]			
Bishop Stillingfleet's "Sermons"—	0	9	0
[Stillingfleet, Edward, bp. of Worcester. <i>Sermons</i> (London, 1673) fol.]			
"Monsieur de Thevenot: his Travels into the Levant, Persia, and the East Indies"—	0	14	0
[Thévenot, Jean de. <i>The Travels of Monsieur de Thevenot into the Levant</i> (London, 1687) fol.]			
Sleidan's "General History of the Reformation"—	0	16	0
[Sleidanus, Johannes. <i>The General History of the Reformation</i> (London, 1689) fol.]			
Camden's "History of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth"—	0	12	0
[Camden, William. <i>The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth</i> (London, 1675) fol.]			
"Helvicus: his Chronology in English"—	0	9	0
[Helwig, Christoph. <i>The Historical and Chronological Theatre</i> (London, 1686) fol.]			
"Dawson: his Origin of Laws"—	2	0	0
[Dawson, George. <i>Origo Legum; or, A Treatise of the Origin of Laws</i> (London, 1694) fol.]			
Monsieur Quentyn's "Compleat Gardener"—	1	0	0
[La Quintinie, Jean de. <i>The Compleat Gard'ner</i> (London, 1693) fol.]			
Evelyn's "Sylva"—	0	12	0
[Evelyn, John. <i>Sylva</i> (London, 1679) fol.]			
"Systema Agriculturae"—	0	9	0
[Worlidge, John. <i>Systema Agriculturae</i> (London, 1681) fol.]			
Cowley's "Works," in 2 vols.—	0	17	0
[Cowley, Abraham. <i>The Works of ...</i> (London, 1668, 1689) fol.]			
Grotius, "Of Peace and War"—			
[Grotius, Hugo. <i>Treatise Concerning the Law of Peace and War</i> (Tr. by William Evans) (London, 1682) fol.]			
Davishe's Books in 1 vol., belonging to the "Rights of Uniformity in Churches"—			
[Davis, Hugh. <i>De Jure Vniformitatis Ecclesiasticae: or Three Books</i> (London, 1669) fol.]			
"Lord Viscount Preston's Trial," etc.—			
[<i>The Arraignment, Tryals and Condemnations of Sir Rich. Grahme</i> (London, 1691) fol.]			

Dr. Samuel Morland's "Tuba Stentoro-phonica"—

[Morland, Sir Samuel. *Description of the Tuba Stenoro-Phonica, or Speaking Trumpet* (London, 1671) fol.]

Books in 4to.:

- "*Thirty Sermons by Divines of the Church of England*"— o 15 0
[?]
- "*The London Divines: their Examination of the Texts of Scripture cited by the Papists for the Proof of their Religion*"— o 12 0
[Fowler, Edward. *Examination of the Texts of Scripture Addressed by Papists, Concerning the Obscurity of the Scriptures* (London, 1688) 4to.]
- "*Examination of Bellarmin's Notes of the Church*"— o 7 0
[Fowler, Edward. *Examinations of Cardinal Bellarmine's Fourth Note of the Church* (London, 1687) 4to.]
- "*A Collection of Speeches of the Right Hon. Henry, late Earl of Warrington*"— o 1 6
[Delamere, Henry Booth, Earl of. *A Collection of Speeches* (London, 1694) 4to.]
- "*History of the late Wars in Ireland,*" with cuts— o 9 0
[Story, George. *An Impartial History of the Wars in Ireland* (London, 1693) 4to.]
- "*Journal of the Campaign in the Spanish Netherlands, 1693*"— o 2 0
[D'Auvergne, Edward. *The History of the Last Campaign in the Spanish Netherlands, 1693* (London, 1694) 4to.]
- *"Dr. South against Dr. Sherlock on the Holy Trinity"— o 5 6
[South, Robert. *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, Entitled A Vindication of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity* (London, 1693) 4to.]
- Clark's "*Analysis of the Bible*"— o 8 0
[Clarke, Samuel. *Survey of the Bible* (London, 1693) 4to.]
- "*Modern Geography rectified*"— o 11 0
[Morden, Robert. *Geography Rectified* (London, 1693) 4to.]
- Stillingfleet's "*Origines Sacrae*"— o 6 0
[Stillingfleet, Edward, bp. of Worcester. *Origines Sacrae* (London, 1662) 4to.]
- Dr. Parker's "*Demonstration of the Law of Nature*"— o 5 6
[Parker, Samuel. *Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature* (London, 1681) 4to.]
- Mr. Kettlewell, "*Of Christian Obedience*"— o 6 6
[Kettlewell, John. *The Measures of Christian Obedience* (London, 1681) 4to.]
- Rogers, "*On the Thirty-nine Articles*"— o 3 0
[Rogers, Thomas. *The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion . . . Expressed in Thirty-Nine Articles* (Cambridge, 1691) 4to.]
- "*Acosta: his History of the East and West Indies*"— o 7 0
[Acosta, José de. *The Natural and Moral History of the East and West Indies* (London, 1684) 4to.]
- "*The Principles of the Muggletonians confuted*"— o 5 0
[Williams, John. *The Absurd and Mischievous Principles of the Muggletonians Considered* (London, 1694) 4to.]

Dr. Sherlock's "Discourse of Providence;" his "Discourse of the Blessed Trinity"—	0	4	0
[Sherlock, William. <i>Discourse Concerning the Divine Providence</i> (London, 1694) 4to. and <i>A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity</i> (London, 1690) 4to.]			
"History of Wars in New England"—	0	1	6
[Mather, Increase. <i>A Brief History of the Warr With the Indians</i> (London, 1676) 4to.]			
"Description of Surinham in Guiana"—	0	0	6
[Warren, George. <i>An Impartial Description of Surinam</i> (London, 1667) 4to.]			
Thirty-nine books and pamphlets relating to the several sorts of trade and commerce—	1	2	6
Glanvil's "Sermons"—	0	5	0
[Glanvil, Joseph. <i>Some Discourses, Sermons and Remains</i> (London, 1681) 4to.]			
Smith's "England's Improvement"—	0	4	0
[Smith, John. <i>England's Improvement Revived</i> (London, 1673) 4to.]			
Manger's "English Gardener"—	0	3	6
[Meager, Leonard. <i>The English Gardener</i> (London, 1683) 4to.]			
"Narration of England's Improvement"	0	4	0
[Coke, Roger. <i>England's Improvements</i> (London, 1675) 4to.]			
Cook's "Manner of Raising, Ordering, and Improving Forest and Fruit Trees"	0	3	6
[Cooke, Moses. <i>The Manner of Raising, Ordering and Improving Forest Trees</i> (London, 1676) 4to.]			
"Mr. Stephen's Two Sermons (a Duplicate) of the 30th of January"—			
[Stephens, William. <i>A Sermon Preached . . . the 30th of Jan. 1693; on Lam. 5. 16</i> (London, 1694) 4to.]			
"The Protestant Bridle: being an Answer to it"—			
[Rogers, Thomas. <i>A True Protestant Bridle, or Some Cursory Remarks upon a Sermon Preached [by William Stephens]</i> (London, 1694) 4to.]			
"Dr. Birch: his Sermon Jan. 30. Oxford House of Commons"—			
[Birch, Peter. <i>A Sermon Preached Before the . . . House of Commons . . . January 30. 1694</i> (London, 1694) 4to.]			
"A Sermon concerning the Lawfulness and Expediency of Church Music"—			
[?]			
"Religion the Only Happiness"—			
[Religion, the Only Happiness (London, 1694) 4to.]			
"The Anatomy of Atheism"—			
[Dawes, Sir William, abp. of Canterbury.] <i>An Anatomy of Atheisme</i> (London, 1693) 4to.]			
"The Passages of Newport"—			
[Cooke, Edward. <i>Certain Passages Which Happened at Newport</i> (London, 1690) 4to.]			
"Dr. Craddock's Sermon before the King"—			
[Cradock, Zachary. <i>A Sermon Preached . . . February 10th 1677/8</i> (London, 1678) 4to.]			

"Bishop of Sarum's Sermon at the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary"—

[Burnet, Gilbert, bp. of Salisbury. *A Sermon Preached . . . April 11, 1689* (London, 1689) 4to.]

Books in 8vo. and 12mo.:

"Bishop of Sarum's Four Discourses: (1) Concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion; (2) The Divinity and Death of Christ; (3) The Infallibility and Authority of the Church; (4) The Obligations to continue in the Communion of the Church"—

[Burnet, Gilbert, bp. of Salisbury. *Four Discourses* (London, 1694) 8vo.]

*His "Discourse of the Pastoral Care"—

[Burnet, Gilbert, bp. of Salisbury. *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London, 1692) 8vo.]

*His "Account of the Life of Bishop Bedell"—

[Burnet, Gilbert, bp. of Salisbury. *The Life of William Bedell* (London, 1685) 8vo.]

*His "Translation of Sir Thos. Moore's 'Utopia'"—

[More, Sir Thomas. *Utopia* (Tr. by Gilbert Burnet) (London, 1684) 8vo.]

*His "Life of Judge Hale"—

[Burnet, Gilbert, bp. of Salisbury. *The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale* (London, 1681) 8vo.]

"Character of Queen Elizabeth and her Ministers of State"—

[Bohun, Edmund. *The Character of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1693) 8vo.]

Father Paul's "Letters"—

[Sarpi, Paolo. *The Letters of the Renowned Father Paul* (Tr. by Edward Brown) (London, 1693) 8vo.]

Sir Josiah Child's "Discourse of Trade"—

[Child, Sir Josiah. *A Discourse about Trade* (London, 1690) 8vo.]

"The Works of the Author of 'The Whole Duty of Man,' in 4 vols.

[Allestree, Richard.] *The Works of the Learned and Pious Author of The Whole Duty of Man* (London, 1694) 8vo.]

Dr. Scot's "Christian Life," in 3 parts in 2 vols.—

[Scott, John. *The Christian Life* (London, 1681-86) 8vo.]

Dr. Burton's "Discourses and Sermons," in 2 vols.—

[Burton, Hezekiah. *Several Discourses* (London, 1684) 8vo. (and) *A Second Volume of Discourses* (London, 1685) 8vo.]

Dr. Wake's "Discourses and Sermons"—

[Wake, William, abp. of Canterbury. *Ten Sermons and Two Discourses* (London, 1690) 8vo.]

Dr. Claggett's "Seventeen Sermons"

[Claggett, William. *Seventeen Sermons* (London, 1689) 8vo.]

Archbishop Tillotson's "Sermons," in 2 vols.—

[Tillotson, John, abp. of Canterbury. *Sermons* (London, 1678) 8vo.]

His "Rule of Faith"—

[Tillotson, John, abp. of Canterbury. *The Rule of Faith* (London, 1666) 8vo.]

Dr. Cave's "Primitive Christianity"—	o	5	o
[Cave, William. <i>Primitive Christianity</i> (London, 1673) 8vo.]			
His "Ancient Church Government"—	o	3	o
[Cave, William. <i>A Dissertation Concerning the Government of the Ancient Church</i> (London, 1683) 8vo.]			
Dr. Puller's "Moderation of the Church of England"—	o	4	o
[Puller, Timothy. <i>The Moderation of the Church of England</i> (London, 1679) 8vo.]			
"Answer to Sir Josiah Child, Of Trade"—	o	5	o
[<i>The Interest of England Considered . . . With Some Remarks upon the Conceptions of Sr. Josiah Child</i> (London, 1693) 8vo.]			
Leybourn's "Panarithmologia Relating to Trade," etc.—	o	4	6
[Leybourn, William. <i>Panarithmologia</i> (London, 1693) 8vo.]			
"George: his Survey of the West Indies"—	o	5	o
[Gage, Thomas. <i>A New Survey of the West Indies</i> (London, 1677) 8vo.]			
Morland's "Vade Mecum"—	o	2	6
[Playford, John. <i>Vade Mecum</i> (London, 1692) 8vo.]			
"Bishop Wilkins: his Sermons"—	o	4	6
[Wilkins, John, bp. of Chester. <i>Sermons</i> (London, 1682) 8vo.]			
His "Natural Religion"—	o	4	o
[Wilkins, John, bp. of Chester. <i>Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion</i> (London, 1675) 8vo.]			
Tullie's "Discourse of the Government of the Thoughts"—	o	2	o
[Tully, George. <i>Discourse of the Government of the Thoughts</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			
"History of the Empire of China"	o	3	6
[Megalhaens, Gabriel de.] <i>A New History of the Empire of China</i> (London, 1689) 8vo.]			
"Jesuit's Memorial for the Intended Reformation of the Church of England"—	o	3	6
[Gee, Edward. <i>Jesuits' Memorial</i> (London, 1690) 8vo.]			
"Present State of the German Empire"—	o	2	6
[May, Louis du. . . <i>The State of the Empire of Germany</i> (London, 1676) 8vo.]			
"History of Monastic Orders"—	o	3	o
[D'Emiliane, Gabriel. <i>A Short History of Monastical Orders</i> (London, 1693) 8vo.]			
Dr. Hammond's "Practical Catechism"—	o	4	o
[Hammond, Henry. <i>A Practical Catechism</i> (London, 1683) 8vo.]			
"Bishop Jewell's Apology, with his Life, by a Person of Quality"	o	3	6
[Jewell, John, bp. of Salisbury. <i>Apology</i> (London, 1685) 8vo.]			
Dr. Horneck's "Law of Consideration"—	o	3	6
[Horneck, Anthony. <i>The Great Law of Consideration</i> (London, 1687) 8vo.]			
His "Best Exercise"—	o	4	6
[Horneck, Anthony. <i>The Happy Ascetick</i> (London, 1681) 8vo.]			
Bishop Nicholson's "Exposition of the Church Catechism"—	o	2	6
[Nicholson, William, bp. of Gloucester. <i>Exposition of the Church Catechisme</i> (London, 1671) 8vo.]			
Bishop Patrick's "Mensa Mystica"—	o	4	6
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>Mensa Mystica</i> (London, 1667) 8vo.]			

His " <i>Christian Sacrifice</i> "—	o	4	o
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>The Christian Sacrifice</i> (London, 1687) 8vo.]			
His " <i>Paraphrase of the Psalms</i> "—	o	6	o
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>The Book of Psalms Paraphrased</i> (London, 1691) 8vo.]			
His " <i>Paraphrase of the Book of Job</i> "—	o	3	o
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>The Book of Job Paraphrased</i> (London, 1679) 8vo.]			
His " <i>Paraphrase on the Proverbs of Solomon</i> "—	o	4	6
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>The Proverbs of Solomon</i> (London, 1683) 8vo.]			
His " <i>Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes</i> "—	o	4	6
[Patrick, Simon, bp. of Ely. <i>The Book of Ecclesiastes</i> (London, 1685) 8vo.]			
Dr. Bates on, " <i>The Divine Attributes</i> "—	o	4	6
[Bates, William. <i>The Harmony of the Divine Attributes</i> (London, 1688) 8vo.]			
Sir William Temple's " <i>Works</i> ," in 2 vols.—	o	10	o
[Temple, Sir William. <i>Miscellanea. The First Part</i> (London, 1689) 8vo. — <i>The Second Part</i> (London, 1690) 8vo.]			
Sir Thomas Pope Blount's " <i>Natural History</i> "—	o	3	6
[Blount, Sir Thomas Pope. <i>A Natural History</i> (London, 1693) 8vo.]			
" <i>Conquest of Florida by the Spaniards</i> "—	o	2	6
[<i>A Relation of the Invasion and Conquest of Florida by the Spaniards</i> (London, 1686) 8vo.]			
" <i>Suetonius: his Lives of the Twelve Caesars in English</i> "—	o	5	o
[Suetonius Tranquillus, C. <i>The Lives of the Twelve Caesars . . . now Done into English by Several Hands</i> (London, 1691) 8vo.]			
" <i>Art of Prudence; or, The Courtier's Oracle</i> "—	o	2	6
[Gracian, Baltasar. <i>The Courtier's Oracle, or The Art of Prudence</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			
" <i>Life of Agathorles, the Sicilian Tyrant</i> "—	o	2	6
[Perrinchief, Richard. <i>The Sicilian Tyrant</i> (London, 1676) 8vo.]			
Plinie's " <i>Panegyrick of the Emperor Trajan</i> " (English)—	o	2	6
[Plinius Caecilius Secundus, C. <i>Pliny's Panegyricke</i> (Tr. by Sir Robert Stapylton) (London, 1686) 8vo.]			
Earl of Carlile's " <i>Embassies to Muscovy</i> "—	o	4	6
[Carlisle, Charles Howard, Earl of. <i>A Relation of Three Embassies</i> (London, 1669) 8vo.]			
Tanner's " <i>Rise of the First Church of God</i> "—	o	3	6
[Tanner, Thomas. <i>Primordia; or The Rise and Growth of the First Church of God Described</i> (London, 1683) 8vo.]			
Gailhard, " <i>Of Settlement after Travel</i> " —	o	2	6
[Gailhard, Jean. <i>Two Discourses. The First Concerning a Private Settlement at Home after Travel</i> (London, 1682) 8vo.]			
" <i>Countryman's Jewell</i> "—	o	2	o
[For this title, STC 1641-1700 refers to S., A. <i>Country-man's Treasure</i>]			

Montaigne's "Essays," in 3 vols.—	o	14	o
[Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. <i>Essays . . . Newly Rendred into English</i> [by Charles Cottom] (London, 1685-1686) 8vo.]			
*Mr. Locke's "Thoughts on Education"—	o	2	6
[Locke, John.] <i>Some Thoughts Concerning Education</i> (London, 1693) 8vo.]			
"Gentleman's Recreation"—	o	5	o
[Cox, Nicholas. <i>The Gentleman's Recreation</i> (London, 1674) 8vo.]			
Dr. Sherlock, "Of the Last Judgment"—	o	3	6
[Sherlock, William. <i>Practical Discourse Concerning a Future Judgement</i> (London, 1692) 8vo.]			
"Judge Hale: his Contemplations, Moral and Divine"—	o	5	o
[Hale, Sir Matthew. <i>Contemplations, Moral and Divine</i> (London, 1677) 8vo.]			
His "Discourse of the Knowledge of God"—	o	4	6
[Hale, Sir Matthew. <i>Discourse of the Knowledge of God</i> (London, 1688) 8vo.]			
Boyle, "Seraphic Law"—	o	2	6
[Boyle, Hon. Robert. <i>Seraphic Love</i> (London, 1660) 8vo.]			
Man, "Of Trade" —	o	2	6
[Mun, Thomas. <i>A Discourse of Trade</i> (London, 1621) 8vo.]			
"Antoninus: his Meditations"—	o	4	6
[Aurelius Antoninus, Marcus. . . . <i>Meditations</i> (Tr. by Meric Casaubon) (London, 1692) 8vo.]			
Dr. King, "Of Worship"—	o	1	6
[King, Peter King, Baron.] <i>An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church</i> (London, 1691-1692) 8vo.]			
"Abridgment of Caesar's Commentaries"—	o	2	6
[Caesar, C. Julius. <i>Commentaries Abridged</i> (London, 1694) 12mo.]			
Euremont's "Essays," in 2 parts—	o	7	o
[Saint-Évremond, Charles de . . . Seigneur de. <i>Miscellaneous Essays</i> (Tr. by John Dryden) (London, 1692-1694) 8vo.]			
Ladies' "Dictionary"—	o	6	o
[<i>The Ladies Dictionary, being a General Entertainment for the Fair Sex</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			
Stillingfleet, "Of Idolatry"—	o	4	6
[Stillingfleet, Edward, bp. of Worcester. <i>Discourse Concerning the Idolatry Practised in the Church of Rome</i> (London, 1672) 8vo.]			
"Answer to the Account of Denmark"—	o	2	6
[King, William. <i>Animadversions on the Pretended Account of Denmark</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			
or,			
Rogers, Thomas. <i>The Commonwealths Man Unmasqu'd, or A just Rebuke to the Author of the "Account of Denmark"</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			
Du Pin's "Life of Christ"—	o	3	6
[Dupin, Louis Ellies. <i>The Evangelical History</i> (London, 1694) 8vo.]			

- Faldo, "Against the Quakers"—
[Faldo, John. *Quakerism no Christianity* (London, 1675) 8vo.] 0 1 6
- Hallywell, "Against Quakers"—
[Hallywell, Henry. *An Account of Familism as Revived by the Quakers* (London, 1673) 8vo.] 0 1 0
- Allen, "Against Quakers"—
[Allen, William. *The Grand Error of the Quakers Detected* (London, 1680) 8vo.] 0 1 0
- Norris, "Against Quakers"—
[Norris, John. *Two Treatises Concerning the Divine Light* (London, 1692) 8vo.] 0 1 0
- "The Swiss Liturgy"—
[Werndly, John Conrad. *Liturgia Tigurina* (London, 1693) 8vo.] 0 2 1
- Peachy's "Herbal"—
[Peachey, John. *Complete Herbal* (London, 1694) 8vo.] 0 3 0
- Sydenham's "Cure of Diseases"—
[Sydenham, Thomas. *Collections of Acute Diseases* (London, 1690) 8vo.] 0 1 0
- "Catalogue of Nobility"—
[*A Catalogue of the Nobility of England* (London, 1690)] 0 0 6
- "Mieges: his New State of England"—
[Miege, Guy. *A New State of England* (London, 1691) 8vo.] 0 4 6
- Milton's "Letters" (English)—
[Milton, John. *Letters of State* (London, 1694) 8vo.] 0 2 6
- Bishop of Cork's "Method of Private Devotion"—
[Wetenhall, Edward, bp. of Kilmore and Ardagh. *A Method and Order for Private Devotion* (London, 1666) 12mo.] 0 2 6
- "Devout Communicant"—
[Seller, Abraham. *The Devout Communicant* (London, 1686) 8vo.] 0 1 6
- *Six books called "The Art of Catechizing; or, The Complete Cate-chist"—
[*The Art of Catechizing; or, The Compleat Catechist* (London, 1691) 8vo.] 0 6 0
- Sir Walter Raleigh's "Remains"—
[Raleigh, Sir Walter. *Remains* (London, 1675) 12mo.] 0 1 6
- Bohun's "Geographic Dictionary"—
[Bohun, Edmund. *A Geographical Dictionary* (London, 1688) 8vo.]
- Cole's "English Dictionary"—
[Coles, Elisha. *An English Dictionary* (London, 1692) 8vo.]
- "Anatomie of the Elder Tree"—
[?]
- "Kalendarum Hortense"—
[Evelyn, John. *Kalendarium Hortense* (London, 1664) 8vo.]
- "Royal Institutions: a Treatise of Silver and Gold Mines"—
[Houghton, Thomas. *Royal Institutions; being Proposals for Articles to Establish and Confirm Laws, Liberties, and Customs of Silver and Gold Mines . . . in . . . Africa and America* (London, 1694) 8vo.]
- Dr. Sherlock's "Discourse of Death"—
[Sherlock, William. *Practical Discourse Concerning Death* (London, 1690) 8vo.]

Hierocles, "*On Pythagoras: his Golden Verses*"—

[Hierocles, of Alexandria. *Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras* (Tr. by J. Norris) (London, 1682) 8vo.]

"*The Golden Rule; or, The Royal Law of Equity*"—

[Goodman, John. *The Golden Rule* (London, 1688) 8vo.]

"*Lady's New Year's Gift*"—

[Halifax, Charles Montagu, Earl of.] *The Ladies New-Year's Gift* (London, 1688) 12mo.]

"*Historical Account of William III.*"—

[*An Historical Account of the Memorable Actions of . . . William III* (London, 1689) 12mo.]

Donington's "*Reformed Devotions*"—

His "*Family Devotions*," in 2 vols.—

[Dorrington, Theophilus.] *Family Devotions* (London, 1693-1694) 8vo.]

[Dorrington, Theophilus.] *Reform'd Devotions* (London, 1693) 12mo.]

"*McMorand*," a Duplicate of the first vol.—

[?]

"*Patrick: his Golden Century of Psalms*"—

[Patrick, John. *A Century of Select Psalms* (London, 1694) 8vo.]

* *Already given to the College.*

Book Review

COMMITTEE ON AID TO LIBRARIES IN WAR AREAS. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BOARD. AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. *Books Published in the United States 1939-1943*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1945. xii, 85 p. 6 x 9 inches. Paper. \$1.25.

The title under review is an important, authoritative, and useful segment of selective national bibliography. Compiled under the responsible direction of the late Charles F. McCombs, Chief Bibliographer of the New York Public Library, for the International Relations Board of the American Library Association, it is coöperative scholarly bibliography which is all too rare of its kind.

Books Published in the United States 1939-1943 is a classified, unannotated list of 1,406 titles of the 50,000 published in this country during these years. Herein are represented, under some eighty headings, selections from all subjects; the whole is tied together by a combined author and fairly detailed subject index. The list's aim was to present books "generally considered contributions to knowledge in their respective fields, or books embodying the results of recent research" written by Americans. Its purpose was "(1) to inform reference libraries, governmental agencies, and individual scholars in war areas of important American books published since the beginning of the war, and (2) to serve as a buying list for books to be purchased for libraries in war areas with funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation."

With these ends in view the A. L. A. Board, having \$100,000 of Rockefeller money at its disposal with which to distribute collections of such books to national libraries, educational and cultural departments, and United States diplomatic agencies, called upon Mr. McCombs. His first step was to make a preliminary selection with the aid of reviews in the scholarly journals included for distribution on a similar scale under a supplementary grant of the Rockefeller Foundation. Assisting him at his request was Randall French, formerly of The John Crerar Library, who assumed responsibility for titles largely in the natural, the applied, and the social sciences. During the course of preliminary selection advice was had from a number of specialists on the staff of the New York Public Library.

Significant as an example of coöperative bibliographical action was the provision of specialized lists by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Special Libraries Association, by the American Library Association, and by other organizations and individuals. These Mr. McCombs sifted, and incorporated from them additional titles into the final list.

Books Published in the United States 1939-1943 excludes periodicals, all but a few annuals, government publications with the exception of certain of the State Department, and law books. Subjects embraced include works both in the humanities, including *belles lettres*, as well as in the sciences. Final choice was determined by the librarian's point of view, according to Mr. McCombs, "but the librarian guided by the opinion of competent scholars."

The A. L. A., with a view to comprehending book publication during the entire period of the war, has already published a supplement to the McCombs list, for 1944 (1946), compiled by Foster M. Palmer, of Harvard College Library, and plans shortly to publish a selection for 1945, also by Mr. Palmer. As an augmentation of these lists of American books, reference may be made to the list of one thousand British books published since 1939, sponsored by the Books and Periodicals Commission of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education.

Hitherto our closest approximations to this list of Mr. McCombs and its supplements, compiled on a comparably comprehensive and selective chronological basis, were the five-year supplements of the A. L. A. Catalogue and the now defunct A. L. A. annual *Booklist Books*. These, however, include books in English whatever the authorship and place of publication, are annotated, and exclude much of the scholarly and technical work to which the McCombs list very largely devotes itself. The fine *United States Quarterly Book List*, published by the Library of Congress, which provides in addition excellent short reviews and bio-bibliographical notes, can be looked upon as a continuation of the latter list.

CECIL J. McHALE

THE AUTHORS IN THIS ISSUE

MANNING HAWTHORNE is the great-grandson of Nathaniel Hawthorne. He graduated from Bowdoin College, and taught English in the University of Maine. He has published a number of articles on Hawthorne.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW DANA is the grandson of the poet Longfellow. After receiving the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Harvard University, he taught at the University of Paris and became Assistant Professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University. He has published books on various subjects and several articles on Longfellow. Mr. Dana and Mr. Hawthorne are now preparing a book on Hawthorne and Longfellow, based on hitherto unpublished manuscript material. This article on "The Origin of Longfellow's *Evangeline*" is in substance one chapter of that book.

The late CARROLL A. WILSON was Chairman of the Society's Committee on Publications. The contents of this issue of the PAPERS were largely planned and directed by Mr. Wilson, and it is the sincere hope of the Committee that he would have been pleased with it.

W. S. TRYON is Professor of History in the College of Liberal Arts, Boston University. For 1946-1947 he is a Guggenheim Fellow in History, and has been doing research on, and preparing a book about, the history of the Boston publishing house of Ticknor and Fields, 1832-1870.

HERMAN W. LIEBERT has been a collector and student of Johnson for more than twenty years. He was for some time a member of the executive editorial staff of the Paul Block Newspapers, and served during the war with the Office of Strategic Services in Washington. He is currently living in New Haven, taking a year off to finish a long-projected book on Johnson.

JOHN MELVILLE JENNINGS is in charge of the Rare Book and Manuscript Division of the Library of the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Virginia. During the late war he served in the Naval Reserve (as Lieutenant junior grade) with duty principally at Pearl Harbor and in the Marianas.

This issue of the PAPERS, like the previous number, was edited by EARLE F. WALBRIDGE, a member of the Reference staff of the Washington Square Library, New York University.